



3 1761 08381803 9

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

P
220-88
J

THE
JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

EDITED BY
CYRUS ADLER AND S. SCHECHTER

VOLUME I

1910-1911

418284
16.12.43

PHILADELPHIA
THE DROPSIE COLLEGE FOR HEBREW
AND COGNATE LEARNING

LONDON: MACMILLAN & COMPANY, LTD.



CAHAN PRINTING CO., INC
PHILADELPHIA
1911

DS

101

J5

v. 1

CONTENTS

PAC

ADLER, CYRUS: Editorial Announcement	
APTOWITZER, V.: The Influence of Jewish Law on the Development of Jurisprudence in the Christian Orient	217
BACHER, W.: Review of "A Manual of the Aramaic Lan- guage of the Babylonian Talmud" by Max L. Margolis	265
BENTWICH, NORMAN: Judaism and Early Christianity; Review of "The Conflict of Religions in the Roman Empire" by Glover	131
DAVIDSON, ISRAEL: Poetic Fragments from the Genizah I and II	105, 231
FRIEDLAENDER, ISRAEL: Jewish-Arabic Studies	183
FRIEDLAENDER, ISRAEL: The Jews of Arabia and the Gaonate	249
FRIEDLAENDER, ISRAEL: The Jews of Arabia and the Rechabites	252
FRIEDLAENDER, ISRAEL: Bonfires on Paganism	257
FRIEDLAENDER, ISRAEL: A Reply to Some Notes on Jewish Arabic Studies by H. Hirschfeld	449
GREENSTONE, JULIUS H.: Two Memorial Lists from the Genizah	43
GREENSTONE, JULIUS H.: Review of "The Graded Sunday School" by Henry H. Meyer	581
HIRSCHFELD, H.: Some Notes on "Jewish-Arabic Studies" by Israel Friedlaender	447
HOSCHANDER, JACOB: Review of "Amurru: The Home of the Northern Semites" by Albert T. Clay	139
HOSCHANDER, JACOB: Review of "The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Governors" by H. V. Hilprecht	41
Montefiore, a	

HUSIK, ISAAC: Review of "Selections from the Arabic Writings of Maimonides" by Israel Friedlaender	275
HUSIK, ISAAC: Review of "Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria" by Norman Bentwich	287
KOHLER, K.: Review of "The Psalms in the Jewish Church" by Oesterley	539
LAUTERBACH, JACOB Z.: The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash	291, 503
MALTER, HENRY: Shem Tob Ben Joseph Palquera I.—II: His Treatise of the Dream	151, 451
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: The Scope and Methodology of Biblical Philology	5
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: The Grouping of the Codices in the Greek Joshua.	259
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: Note on Bacher's review of Margolis' Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud	274
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: Review of "Ecclesiasticus. The Greek text of Codex 248" edited by J. H. A. Hart	403
MARGOLIS, MAX L.: Some Recent Publications Dealing with the Bible	547
MARX, ALEXANDER: Studies in Gaonic History and Literature	61
MARX, ALEXANDER: Review of the edition of Berakot by N. Pereferkowitsch	279
MARX, ALEXANDER: Review of "Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy"	425
MISHCON, A.: The Suppressed Parts of a Shabu'ot Piyut	533
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: Review of "Jerusalem" by George Adam Smith	123
RADIN, MAX: A Papal Brief of Pius IV	113
RHINE, A. B.: The Secular Hebrew Poetry of Italy	341
SCHECHTER, S.: Editorial Announcement	I
TISDALL, W. ST. CLAIR: The Āryan Words in the Testament I	

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

JULY 1910

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

THE New Series of THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, the first number of which is herewith presented to the public, forms the continuation of the twenty stately volumes edited, under the same name, from 1888 to 1908, by Mr. Israel Abrahams and Mr. Claude G. Montefiore. In the issue of October, 1907, the Editors announced their intention, at the end of the current fiscal year, to discontinue the publication of their periodical, by reason of the many duties devolving upon them, which made it impossible for them to continue their laborious editorial work.

At a meeting of the Board of Governors of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, held in June, 1908, the announcement of the proposed discontinuance of the QUARTERLY elicited a general expression of regret, and it was then resolved not to allow the only organ for Jewish learning in the English language to disappear. A correspondence ensued between the President of the Board of Governors of the College and Messrs. Abrahams and Montefiore, and the result was that the English Editors and

Publishers ceded all rights in the title to the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. The Governors of the College take this opportunity of expressing their appreciation of the generous spirit in which the negotiations were conducted, and of acknowledging their sense of obligation to the former management.

The undersigned, the President of the College, and the President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, who is at the same time a Governor of the Dropsie College, have been entrusted with the editorship of the New Series of THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW. They have been successful in securing the co-operation of eminent scholars, and they cherish the hope that they will be able to maintain the high standard of excellence which, under their predecessors, the REVIEW reached as a repository of Jewish and Cognate Learning. They repeat the assurance given in the inaugural number of the First Series, that contributions from all sources will be welcome. Upon the merit of an article alone will depend its admission to the pages of the REVIEW.

The fact that the REVIEW has passed from the hands of private individuals into those of a learned institution with a strict academic character makes it incumbent upon the Editors to formulate their policy according to the model of academic publications. This will necessitate the exclusion of all matter not falling within the province of Jewish history,

literature, philology, and archæology, though popular articles upon these subjects, if they are conceived in a scientific spirit and bear the marks of original research will be readily admitted.

In another respect too the policy pursued in the First Series will be modified. Heretofore, the REVIEW contained a considerable amount of matter relating to the history of the Jews of England. As there is a Society devoted to this subject in particular, which publishes the results of its investigations, only articles of special importance or universal interest relating to English Jewish History will be accepted for the REVIEW. The same policy will be made to apply to American Jewish History, which likewise is cared for in the regular publications of an active Society making research into the history of the Jews in America its peculiar object.

In general, the main purpose of the Editors is to supply a need which is greatest felt just in those departments of Jewish learning for which neither the regular theological periodicals nor the local historical societies make sufficient provision.

The Editors feel it all the more their duty to supply the need, as America is fast becoming the center of Jewry, and in all likelihood will become also the center of Jewish learning in the English world. It would be anomalous if,

in the face of this great present growth, the past with its glory and its sacrifices, its ideals and its achievements, its lessons and its inspirations, were not offered the opportunity of that articulate utterance which can be given to it only through the mouth of science and scholarship.

With these aims in view, and bespeaking the interest and co-operation of scholars and laymen alike, the Editors take up their task.

CYRUS ADLER

S. SCHECHTER

THE SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF BIBLICAL PHILOLOGY

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College

The present paper is intended as the forerunner of a larger work planned after the manner of Boeckh's "*Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaft*"¹ and S. Reinach's "*Manuel de philologie classique*"². What has been done so successfully and on so comprehensive a scale for classical philology, has to the knowledge of the writer not been attempted for the wide field of biblical philology; and while a work of this character constitutes a pressing need to instructor and student alike, a shorter sketch, though it must necessarily fall short of the ideal requirements, will at least indicate the nature of the want. It has not been deemed advisable to encumber this tentative effort with anything like an exhaustive bibliographical apparatus which must be reserved for the larger work; in the main the footnotes serve the purpose of relieving the body of the text from unwieldy parentheses. The choice of one concrete example for the illustration of the various philological operations to which the Scriptures may be subjected will no doubt commend itself to the judicious reader; if the name of one modern commentator occurs in this connection quite frequently, it is because he is rightly considered the representative of a certain class of exegetes.

1. In English, three distinct sciences appear to be

thrown together under the one name "philology": (a) the (general) science of language, also called linguistic science, or linguistics, and sometimes designated, since it must have a Greek name, as glottology³,—a science which has for its object a study of the origin and development of language in general, dealing, whether in a philosophical or historical manner, not so much with this or that particular language, but with all languages, exemplifying amidst the variety of types the universal laws governing articulate speech as a vehicle of thought, the phonetic decay of words, their semantic development, etc.; (b) the comparative grammar⁴ of a group of cognate languages, illustrating the dialectal variations of a real or supposed parent language as they develop into separate languages, and pointing out their common laws of structure; such, of course, is the subject only of "comparative" philology; accordingly, "philology" minus the qualifying adjective is identified with the grammatical and lexicographical study of a language, and in the popular mind the philologist is solely and simply a grammarian or dictionary writer; (c) philology proper, which has been defined by its master-builders as nothing short of that science which has for its aim the knowledge of human thought as far as it has been expressed⁵.

2. Now the modes of expressing thought are diverse: it may be by means of a statue or painting or structure,—thought carved in stone, or painted on canvas, or embodied in a cathedral,—or by means of gesture, the mimicry of language⁶, or finally by means of articulate speech, the word spoken (or written). Psychology and logic are equally

**Relation of
Philology to
Cognate
Sciences**

thought carved in stone, or painted on canvas, or embodied in a cathedral,—or by means of gesture, the mimicry of language⁶, or finally by means of articulate speech, the

concerned with human thought, but their province is the *formal* side of thought, the laws governing the origin or possibility or sequences of thought. Philology deals with the *matter* of thought: back of the word it would divine the thought, recover it in its original lucidity and make it throb again with the warmth that suffused it when it was first ushered into the world. Philology's twin sister is History: according to some⁷ the two are identical; others conceive of philology as the handmaiden of history, both covering the same range of subjects, except that the method which is always apparent in the philological operation remains latent in the historical presentation⁸. Over against those sciences whose scope consists in discovering universal laws under which particular phenomena may be subsumed, the historico-philological sciences are pre-eminently concerned with the particular, with Personality, whether it be that of an individual or that of a collective aggregate of humanity⁹.

3. Philology is a science to be sure, but also an art (τέχνη); and philological instruction means largely the teaching of a sum of technical devices¹⁰.

The student must be taught early to survey his field and possess himself of the tools. For if philology aims at reproducing thought, the actual matter of thought that passed through a human brain and thrilled a human soul, interpretation becomes the chief philological operation; and if interpretation is to lead to understanding as lucid and immediate as when a man speaks to us face to face, it must be mediated by as complete an array of data as we can gather, confronted as we often are by a foreign idiom or by a literary

Philology also
an Art

document composed in by-gone days. Mediated understanding—that is what philological interpretation amounts to¹¹. While immediate understanding is in itself a complex process, yet made simple and instantaneous through long practice, the mediated philological understanding is necessarily a still more laborious one requiring long study and steadfast perseverance; in the end, it is true, the expert gains a certain tact which sometimes works immediately and as it were by divination.

4. The business of the philologist thus seems to be the faithful, lifelike, portraiture of thought in all its individual content and coloring. There was a constellation of events that was unique; and in that unique constellation there lived a unique man; and that man gave utterance to a unique thought which the philologist would recover from beneath the rubbish of the past. But there is also a constructive side to philology. The philologist, if possessed of an imitative faculty that is perfect, will see with the author's eyes and re-think his thoughts, be he epic bard or dramatist or prophet or psalmist; but he can do more: he can bring to bear upon the single utterance or a piece of literature all the known facts backward and forward that stand in relation thereto and view it synthetically. It has been said that the philologist understands the orator and poet better than they understood themselves or were understood by their contemporaries; for what to them was immediate and matter-of-fact, is turned by the philologist into *conscious cognition*¹².

5. Since human culture which is the object of philolo-

gical investigation is national in character, and since of all the corporate cultural achievements of a nation it is in language that the national genius primarily manifests itself, it follows that the divisions of philology must follow the boundaries of linguistic areas. There will naturally be found on the philological chart vast territories, like the Indo-European or Semitic, and smaller domains like the Greek or Hebrew. Whatever may be the heritage which the Hebrews received from their Semitic forefathers, the individuality of the sons of Eber stands off clearly by itself over against the sum total of culture possessed by all the children of Shem alike. But even in the culture of Israel, or of the Jewish people, which can justly be made the subject of encyclopædic treatment, the Biblical literature may be properly placed apart and given over to a specific department of study. The justification of a Biblical philology is not merely to be found in the vastness of the philological labor that is requisite for the interpretation of the thought deposited therein, but rather in the unique character of the Scriptures of which the formation of the canon by the Jews themselves was the first conscious appreciation. In the following pages a survey of the scope of Biblical philology is attempted.

Biblical Philology as a Separate Department of Study justified by the Formation of the Canon

6. First in order naturally comes the *interpretatio verborum*, פרוש המלות. It is rooted in grammar and lexicon. A concrete example may help define both. Job 3, 3 reads: יֵאָבֵד יוֹם אִוִּלָּד בּוֹ יֵאָבֵד יוֹם אִוִּלָּד בּוֹ. Our first business is reading (de-

*Interpretatio
verborum:*
Grammatical

cipherment, pronunciation). We recognize a number of symbols (letters,¹³ אותיות). They are naturally treated at the very threshold of grammar: the script, more specifically the square script (כתיבה מרבעת) which we learn to understand as the Aramaic development of the older Hebrew¹⁴ (עברי) with the ligatures broken through¹⁵. We learn about the traditional order of the alphabet¹⁶ and the names of the letters¹⁷. Their consonantal function we likewise learn from tradition; their grouping according to the organs of speech is equally old.¹⁸ That belongs already to that division of grammar which treats of sounds (phonetics). Next we observe the points¹⁹ (נקודות). As symbols they are treated again in the chapter concerning the script where we learn their traditional names and their history²⁰, also the fact that the manuscripts present another system of notation²¹. In the phonology we are made acquainted with the vowels of which they are symbols; we also find that the parallel system has a bearing upon pronunciation.²² The point which we find (three times) within a letter is treated again under script as well as under phonetics²³. A third set of symbols²⁴ indicating the accents²⁵ (טעמים) is equally elucidated under script and phonetics²⁶, though their exact function can be mastered only at the end of the grammar²⁷. In the script we shall also find the vowel-letters²⁸ ו, י discussed; and in the phonology the absorption²⁹ of the א in יאֵכר will be accounted for. In the phonetic part of the grammar we shall also learn to distinguish the first א as originating in a primitive³⁰ *a*, the second as the resultant of a contracted diphthong *aw*, the third as due to a similar contraction over the slurred laryngal *h* which was really the all-important

element of the pronominal suffix; the grammatical determination of the fourth is bound up with a lexicographical (exegetical) question which will come up subsequently. Similarly we shall learn in the same part of grammar to treat separately the first and the third, the second, the fourth, and the fifth ־ ; in the same manner to hold apart the first and last ־ . All these distinctions will be found to be an aid to sense. The inseparable prefixes ב and י are again a subject for the chapter concerning the script³¹. On the other hand, we shall expect to find elucidated in the phonology the recession of the accent with which we meet three times in our verse.

7. The first two parts of grammar have taught us to read (pronounce accurately). We read of course according to tradition, the living tradition which is multifarious; but sporadic allusions in early grammatical literature³² bring us nearer to the pronunciation current in the schools of the authors of the punctuation (נקרנים). Latin and Greek transliterations³³ on the whole substantiate tradition, though pointing to a less fixed pronunciation which here and there is more archaic. A traditional chanting exists also which is equally diverse³⁴.

8. We proceed now to the Word which is a combination of sounds expressive of sense. The third part of grammar, the morphology, disengages the stem from its formative accretions and classifies forms according to their inner inflection (characteristic of the Semitic languages). Formative elements, forms, and words are also classified according to their function in the sentence (in a preliminary way at least). Thus אֶבֶר is determined as $\text{אֶבֶר} + \text{י}$, the י indicat-

**Traditional
Pronunciation**

Morphology

ing the third person singular masculine of the pre-form³⁵ and the remainder being the simple stem of the root אָבַר; similarly אָוֵלַר as אָ + נ + וֵלַר, the אָ indicating the first person singular of the pre-form, the נ³⁶ a formative stem-accretion belonging to the N-stem, and what follows being the root יָלַד³⁷. יוֹם and נָבֵר³⁸ are placed under one type (מִשְׁקָל)³⁹. The identification of types, in our present knowledge (or ignorance) of Hebrew (Semitic) grammar, here and there leads to a hint concerning the function (category) of the noun⁴⁰, but just as often leaves us in the dark⁴¹. And so on.

9. Morphology helps us in the main to consult the lexicon for the meaning of the root. The lexicon contains

**The Lexicon.
The Sources
of the Lexi-
cographer**

more than that. For, although the stem-differentiation along with modal distinctions is dealt with in the grammar⁴², there are manifold *nuances* which the grammar is

powerless to reduce to law beyond the vaguest outline and which therefore are conscientiously noted in the lexicon. We may lay our unfinished grammar aside for a moment, and turn to the lexicon. אָבַר means *perish*; יָלַד *bear*; יוֹם *day*; נָבֵר *man*. We select in each case of course the most general meaning. What are the lexicographer's sources? Tradition, primarily; supported or supplemented by the consonance of the traditional meaning with the context in the greatest number of places, by the ancient versions⁴³, by later Hebrew⁴⁴, by the cognate languages. In the case of rarer words⁴⁵ and especially of *hapax legomena* (מִלּוֹת בּוֹדְרוֹת) the rabbis already found themselves in perplexity⁴⁶ and very likely at an earlier date the ancient versions⁴⁷; Saadya helped himself by reference to later Hebrew, others like himself either tacitly or avowedly compared Aramaic⁴⁸ or Arabic⁴⁹; a process repeated on a larger scale since the days of

Schultens and Ludolf, with Ethiopic, Assyrian, Phœnician, Southern Arabic to swell the apparatus; and in the case of words apparently borrowed or foreign we consult Sanskrit and Iranian and Armenian and Egyptian, and possibly even Greek⁵⁰. The meaning of rare words, particularly when other means fail, must be determined from the context (לפי ענינו, לפי מקומו); but the context cannot give certainty or absolute definiteness; it often represents a circle which to be sure shuts out all sorts of possible meanings, but within which there is still ample variety to choose from. The honest lexicographer will add a sign of query to many a meaning thus ascertained, or, with Rashi, admit his ignorance (לא ידעתי).

10. The Word has thus far been treated in isolation, but human speech does not consist of detached words. The Sentence is the unit of speech. Within the sentence each word has its function and **Syntax. Functional Part** more or less its fixed position. Function goes in the developed state of the language with form⁵¹; and conversely formative elements with functional force are lost through phonetic decay⁵². The theory of functions within the sentence as a unit belongs to the first part of syntax⁵³, where also the various kinds of sentences are described⁵⁴. Thus יום יאבד is a verbal clause, an optative sentence; יום is subject, יאבד is predicate. *Perish the day!* The next sentence may at first be treated without reference to the preceding clause, in artificial isolation. What is the function of the pre-form⁵⁵? The parallel passage, Jerem 20, 14 has: יִלְדֹתִי בּוֹ. The English Version renders both passages alike: *I was born*. Is it beyond the power of the English language to express the particular *nuance* which belongs to אולד over against ילדתי?

or are the two really identical? According to Kautzsch we ought to render: *I was to be born*. He compares II Kings 3, 27: *his eldest son אִשָּׁר יִמְלֹךְ that was to reign*. On the other hand, Ewald and Driver interpret: *nascendus eram, I was being born*, the event being represented as nascent, and so, the speaker "seizing upon it while in movement rather than while at rest, pictured with peculiar vividness to the mental eye"; the usage is said to be peculiar of the language of poetry, though traces of it are found also in prose.⁵⁶ But there is another view quite as plausible: אִשָּׁר, to speak the language of Greek grammar, is aorist minus augment.⁵⁷ As in Greek, such forms are archaic, hence confined to poetry. And it is part of the interpreter's business to distinguish between prose and poetry.

11. The concluding part of grammar is the syntax proper which deals with co-ordination and subordination of sentences. The first half of our verse consists of two sentences combined in a syntactical relation. In the prose parallel אִשָּׁר intervenes to indicate the relation. In Arabic, the omission of the corresponding relative is conditioned by the indeterminateness of the antecedent. In Hebrew no such conditions seem to have been considered requisite.⁵⁸ But the omission of אִשָּׁר is peculiar of poetry. יוֹם is in the construct state.⁵⁹

12. In the present instance, the verbal interpretation is almost tantamount to the contextual interpretation, פְּרִיטָה. The context being rhetorical and poetic, the interpreter must add stylistic observations. Thus the *parallelismus membrorum* obtrudes itself immediately upon his attention. What is the subject of אֲמַר? AV.: *and the*

night in which it was said; hence *הַאֲמַר* is subject.⁶⁰ RV., on the other hand, takes *הַלַּיְלָה* as subject: *and the night which said*. Either is grammatically correct; according to the former interpretation supply: *בו*.⁶¹ When we consult tradition, we find that AV. has the support of the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Saadya, Ibn Janah, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Ralbag; on the side of RV. we find among the ancients the Targum with its paraphrase: *and the angel that is set over conception at night, who said*. The source of the Targumic paraphrase is the rabbinic saying: *the angel that is set over conception, Lailah (= Night) is his name*.⁶² This is apparently haggadic; but it proves that the rabbis took *הַלַּיְלָה* as subject; the introduction of the angel sets aside the poetic personification of an inanimate object which to them was an objectionable feature. That such scruples existed, can be proved from numerous passages in the Targum.⁶³ But an important observation is here in place. Back of the haggadic there always lies a certain conception of the simple, unsophisticated, sense, which conception may be erroneous or true, but it constitutes the rabbinic interpretation which it is our duty to record. The discovery of the *פֶּשֶׁט* behind the *מדרש*, be the latter *מדרש* *הנדרה* or *מדרש הלכה*, would furnish ample material for a monograph.⁶⁴ In the present passage, the rabbinic interpretation coincides with that of RV. and of most moderns, Fried. Delitzsch alone, so far as I can see, going with AV. Budde even adds that the night is conceived by the poet as "*geheimnisvolles Geisterwesen*", a mysterious ghostly being;

The *פֶּשֶׁט* be-

hind the *מדרש*

this certainly comes close to the rabbis! A few remarks on the subject of traditional exegesis will also be in place. That the (lexical) meaning of words is based mainly on tradition has been mentioned above. But what I have in mind now is contextual interpretation. The meanings of **לילה** and **אמר** by themselves were indeed fixed by tradition. But the meaning of the clause **אמר והלילה** may and may not have been a matter of tradition. We cannot say with certainty whether a given rabbinic interpretation, even when it is reported anonymously, was the commonly accepted one at that time. Place, time, and the idiosyncrasies of individual minds must have occasioned differences. Saadya, in the present case and elsewhere, apparently does not consider himself bound by rabbinic interpretation. There is no unanimity among the ancient versions or among the mediæval Jewish commentators. Here and there we find a **כך שמעתי** or **כך מצאתי** hinting at some sort of tradition; but when traced to its source, it may have represented but an individual's reasoning unsupported by further tradition. In Rashi's days, discoveries were being made daily in the simple sense⁶⁵; and the motto apparently was, *Dies diem docet*. It was known that the true sense must be simple, but that the simple sense was not necessarily the common; that the **פישט** must not be labored, but that it is not gotten without labor; that the simple sense was as deep (**עומק הפישט**) as the homiletical, but that, when discovered, it seemed obvious. Of course, the interpretation of authoritative minds tends to become traditional; but then it is not a question of what it came to be, but what it was originally. For if originally based on reasoning, it must pass once more before the bar of reason. Moreover, reason itself represents

a growth; and what is reasonable at one time, may not be so at other times, and *vice versa*; a rational interpretation is one thing, and a rationalistic quite another. It would be a meritorious piece of work to determine with accuracy the degree of unanimity among Bible commentators of repute, ancient and modern. For, though Biblical exegesis has been the playground of genius and mediocrity, and individual guesses have been well nigh countless, nevertheless in the exegetical struggle for existence there has been at work natural selection, the fittest interpretation surviving, while the ephemeral was consigned to well-merited oblivion. It is for the purpose of illustrating my point that I resurrect here the following gem of absurdity perpetrated by the Biurist Landau: "*die Nacht, die dem Mann verkündete: Sie hat empfangen*" (the night, which brought tidings to the husband, She hath conceived).⁶⁶

Exegetical
Unanimity

13. הָרָה נִבֵּר, of course, is not easy. As for the verb, it would seem on the basis of the parallelistic construction of the two halves of the verse, that it might be determined by the equation הָרָה = אֹלֵד = x: *was born*. The nearest parallel is Cant. 3, 4: עַד שֶׁבִּיאֲתִי אֶל בֵּית אִמִּי וְאֶל חֲדָר הַחוּרָתִי; hence הָרָה (participle) is a synonym of יוֹלֶדֶת (אֵם). Synonymity, of course, need not be identity. The common element is merely: *motherhood*. יוֹלֶדֶתִי is *my mother as she that bare me*. That הָרָה indicates a stage anterior to יֹלֵד, is shown by the frequently recurring phrase וְתֵהָרָה וְתֹלֵד, then by a passage like Isa. 26, 18, where, though the whole is said figuratively of anxious and disappointed

Exegetical
Difficulties

waiting, the three verbs denote the three stages: conception, the approach of parturition, and parturition itself; compare also Hosea 9, 11 a climax of calamities: *there shall be no birth* (לדה), *and none with child* (בטן), *and no conception* (הריון). Leaving on the side I Chron. 4, 17, we find הרה with an object in the metaphorical sense of planning evil, etc., but also in the physical sense, as in Moses' question: האנכי הריתי את כל העם הזה אם אנכי ילדתיהו Num. 11, 12. Accordingly הרה נבר, in agreement with Symmachus, Vulgate, Syriac, Targum, means: *conceptus est homo, there is conceived a man*. We are then to interpret the first half of the verse as referring to the day of birth, and the second as treating of the night of conception. Saadya, Ibn Ezra, and Fried. Delitzsch simplify the matter by taking the two synonyms, הרה and ילר, as identical; Saadya and Ibn Ezra support their rendering by adducing I Chron. 4, 17,—a methodological error, *obscurum per obscurius*,—and Fried. Delitzsch refers to Cant. 3, 4,—but even there the parallelism need not be one of identity, for הורתי means: *she that conceived me*, hence: *my mother*. Duhm argues strenuously against the supposition that the poet alludes to two different occasions, on æsthetic grounds⁸⁷. Aesthetic judgments are necessarily of a subjective character; in this particular instance the æsthetic argument is contradicted by verse 10, where the reference to conception is unmistakable. A second difficulty is felt by many commentators with regard to נבר, which, they say, means: *vir adultus*, the grown man. Hence it is that Rashi took הרה in a causative sense: *A man hath caused to conceive*⁸⁸. It is not easy to defend this view grammatically. As a causative, הרה could only come from the root ירה, and, at least in its ordinary sense: *point out, direct, teach*, it is unsuitable. Yet,

a defense could be bolstered up, and the meaning *fructify* vindicated for ירה⁶⁹. Accordingly the — would have originated in *aw*, whereas, according to the current interpretation, it is the equivalent of *u*⁷⁰.

14. Some moderns resort to emendation. Here we are introduced to another philological operation: textual criticism (the lower criticism). Criticism is an offshoot of the *interpretatio*. It means, when our exegetical skill is taxed to the utmost and we are (actually or seemingly) confronted by non-sense⁷¹, a regress from the present form of the text to an earlier, better, the original perchance, from tradition vitiated to tradition restored. For the stretch of time intervening between the original⁷² and the earliest manuscript extant is a long one; alterations ensue, some intentional⁷³, others of an irrational character⁷⁴. Parallel texts⁷⁵ and the versions prove at least the existence of variants. The marginal readings of the received text represent emendations; but often just parallel readings, which were mistaken in aftertimes for corrections. A treatise on the קריין is still to be written. Another monograph should be devoted to (1) the אל תקרי ; (2) מסעין, סבירין⁷⁶; (3) conjectural emendations in the guise of grammatical or rhetorical rules⁷⁷ in the works of the mediæval Jewish exegetes, notably Ibn Janah and Tanhum. Here is also the place for a proper definition of the Masoretic Text. It is apparently nothing more than the text found in manuscripts and early prints substantiated by that system of annotations which we call Masorah⁷⁸. It is true, the Synagogue has its *textus receptus* which is sufficient for practical purposes. So it has its *textus receptus* of the Tal-

Textual Criticism an Offshoot of the Interpretatio

Definition of the Masoretic Text

mud. But the real text of the Talmud is at present buried in manuscripts, and indirectly in quotations⁷⁹; and the farther we ascend⁸⁰, the more the text is found to diverge, the greater the number of variants. For in the history of every text there is such a thing as a leveling process; the more a book is read, the more it will tend to uniformity.⁸¹ The genuine text of the Talmud, as far as we can get at it, despite some good preliminary work that has been done,⁸² awaits reconstruction; and the reconstruction of a text is a philological operation which has its rules that must be mastered⁸³. Equally the reconstruction of the Biblical text, not yet the original, but the Masoretic form thereof⁸⁴, awaits consummation at the hands of a master trained in the school of philology. And much even will remain doubtful. For, in the first place, the Masoretic system of annotations, gigantic though it be, is necessarily incomplete, and we fall back upon the manuscripts themselves which are not uniform. Then examples abound of divergent masorahs (מסורות מתחלפות).⁸⁵ The Talmud has been found to be at variance with *our* Masorah. The masoretic vigilance certainly antedates the written Masorah; we must therefore seek to attain to the oral Masorah. In the case of conflicts, Norzi considers the Targum as an arbiter. We know today that the Targum is based on the Oriental (מרחאי) recension of the text; we further know, what Norzi did not know, that the Targum of Proverbs is bodily (with slight changes) taken over from the Syriac Version, which frequently incorporates Septuagintal readings. Norzi, on one occasion, even quotes a reading from the Seventy; he significantly adds that we must not deviate from the tradition of our fathers (ואנו אין לנו לזוז ממסרת שמסרו לנו אבותינו).⁸⁶ That is on the whole a safe principle for reasons which will become apparent later. But we know that the Masoretic

text is in the main presupposed by Vulgate, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, some further anonymous Greek versions, and the Hexaplaric texts of the Septuagint. The artificial boundary-line between masoretic and pre-masoretic, at least for strictly scientific purposes, thus falls to the ground. It will be the business of the future editor of the Masoretic text to adduce all the corroboration of the reconstructed text wheresoever he will find

How the Masoretic Text is to be reconstructed

it, be it manuscript evidence, or a masoretic note, or a quotation from a lost codex, or the Targum, or Aquila, or a Hexaplar manuscript. He will naturally also be in duty bound to register variants, be it from the margin, or from the Talmud, or from the Targum, or from the Greek evidence. Many will be the difficulties that must beset his path, and many the problems raised. But scientific work is never finished; and the sum of knowledge often represents but a bundle of questions. When he comes to use the evidence of the versions, be it the Targum only, he will be

The Use of the Versions

confronted by such texts as are themselves in need of philological reconstruction; and even with a clean text before him, he will at every step face the query: Variant or paraphrase? The problems of retroversion become manifold, when the evidence of the oldest version, the Septuagint, is approached⁸⁷. The supreme test is again the ability to distinguish between actual variant (in the "*Vorlage*") and free translation. Freedom may be due to general motives (religious scruples and the like) or to individual idiosyncracies. Also the degree of freedom need not be the same: contrast the Pentateuch with Proverbs or Job. But before we are confronted by the dilemma: Freedom or variant, we must be sure of our Greek text which simply teems with variants.

Holmes-Parsons and now the larger Cambridge edition contain but the readings; these await judicious sifting. For some are utterly worthless and eliminable as inner-Greek corruptions or wilful (Christian for instance) alterations; others represent parallel renderings of the same Hebrew word or phrase. The Septuagint student must consult not only manuscripts (uncial, cursive) and early prints (Complutensian, Aldine, Sixtine), but also the daughter-versions (Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Sahidic, Bohairic, Armenian) and quotations (church-fathers, New Testament, Josephus, Philo). The apparatus is a complex one; to ignore it is to forego the claim to scientific accuracy.

15. A good example is afforded by the passage in Job. For הָרָה זָכָר the Septuagint has: Ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν, *Lo, a male!*

**An Example
afforded by
the Present
Passage**

The omission of ἰδοὺ in one manuscript need not detain us. Nor need the Sahidic paraphrase: *It is a male child*⁸⁸ cause comment. The Bohairic and Syriac literally reproduce the Greek.—The Latin (based on the Hexapla) has: *Conceptus est homo*, which means simply a reversion on the part of Origen to the “*Hebraica veritas*”, substantiating at least the Hebrew text for those “pre-masoretic” days. It is tolerably certain, however, that the Greek translator wrote: Ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν, *Lo, a male!* What did he read in his Hebrew text? Duhm answers: הָנָה זָכָר, which of course does away with all the difficulties, real or supposed⁸⁹, at a bound. He adds: “Unser הָרָה könnte von einem Abschreiber herrühren, der versehentlich das nachbiblische הָנָה, siehe, für הָרָה schrieb.” This bit of wisdom comes from Geiger who, however, ascribes this confusion to the translator who had a scruple to translate delicate matters literally. Geiger is really

guilty of a contradiction; for if the translator had that scruple, the adventitious aid of a misread (mispointed) הרה becomes unnecessary. As for Duhm's identification of ἄρσεν with זָכָר, he is of course thinking of the graphic similarity of ב and כ. But Gen. 7, 2 (twice) אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ is rendered ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ; so do our English versions render: *the male and his female*; yet, I am sure, no one will pretend that the Greek translator (let alone the English) read: זָכָר וְנָקְבָּה. The translator simply ignored a bit of Pentateuchal criticism and with the least of concern assimilated a J to a P phrase! Similarly ἄρσεν is employed for בֵּן and יָלָד⁹⁰. All that ἄρσεν need point to, is a masculine noun, denoting a human being whether grown or in childhood. Thus זָכָר might be rendered ἄρσεν with impunity; and there is no warrant that something else was read. As for הרה, the translator may perchance have been misled by the late Hebrew הֲרָה. There was, however, a psychologic motive for his error: not so much the scruple about translating delicate matters literally, but because his literary taste (which he shared with Duhm) shrank from ascribing to the poet a double reference to the day of birth and to the night of conception. Job curses the νυχθήμερον of his birth; *voilà tout*. That the translator was quite capable of mispointing his text shall not be gainsaid. To mention one example among many: הַלְמוֹת ὄνειδος *dreams for ox-tongue* 6, 6! Nor is it to be denied that the translator found in his "Vorlage" many a variant; thus, for example, תִּנְעִנֶן *will ye weary* for תִּנְיִן *will ye vex* 19, 2. Were I to edit the Masoretic text critically, I should print in the text הָרָה זָכָר and in the *argumentum* the following sources: א (א¹, i. e. the form is a *hapax legomenon*) Heb. Σ(ἐννύθη ἄνθρωπος)

𐤁 (ראתבטן נברא) 𐤁 (*conceptus est homo*) 𐤁 (אתברא נבר); "was created" more decorous than "was conceived") also 𐤁 (*ἰδοὺ ἄρσεν* freedom)⁹¹.

16. Back of Duhm's dual objection to the received text there really lurks a subtler motive which affords an example

**The Higher
Criticism.**

**Determination
of Date**

of the influence of the *higher* criticism on textual (on interpretation). Duhm is convinced that the poet imitates Jerem. 20, 14-18.⁹² His pronouncement is of course based on highly subjective grounds; but it furnishes a handle for determining the date of our poem. "The poet, in 3, 3 ff., is dependent upon Jerem. 20, 14 ff.," thus runs the categorical statement in the Introduction. The poem was therefore composed some time after Jeremiah. This, of course, is a vague date; to render it more definite, further observations are requisite. Duhm supplies them. He is not quite sure that 12, 20-25 may not belong to an interpolator. But then repetitions are a peculiar feature of our poem. Be that as it may, verses 14-25 mirror the "Seelenzustand" of post-exilic Jewry. "All things are come to nought, nations and empires, the aristocracy and priesthood—such was the impression made on them by external history by virtue of the continued national catastrophes everywhere." Hence, at the time when our poet wrote, the successive wars of Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians, as well as the downfall of the Jewish state, were a matter of the past. When the poet bitterly complains (9, 24): *When a land is given into the hand of a wicked man, He covereth the face of the rulers thereof*⁹³, Duhm sees therein an allusion to conditions such as prevailed in the Persian period. "If we were better acquainted with the history of the first centuries following the exile, we would be in a position to

fix the date of the author of the poem still more accurately." Duhm proceeds to find in Job, in the passages wherein the greatness of God is glorified, reminiscences from Deutero-Isaiah. As for the *terminus ad quem*, the points of contact between the poem and the Priests' Code go to show that the latter is dependent upon the former; thus the cosmological conceptions of the first chapter of Genesis are farther advanced than the corresponding notions in Job 38. Accordingly, the date of the poem is placed in the first half of the fifth century B. C. While thus the priority of the curse in Jeremiah is to Duhm (and others) an assured fact, certain critics look upon Job 3 as the original, some even going to the length of pronouncing Jerem. 20, 14-18 an interpolation on the basis of Job. Whatever be the answer, the query is certainly a justifiable one; of course, the two passages may be both dependent upon a common source, in which case the question would have no bearing whatsoever on the date of Job. An example has at any rate been afforded for the manner in which the date of a work may be ascertained under favorable conditions from internal evidence.

17. The *interpretatio verborum* is incomplete without the *interpretatio rerum*. Thus, in the present instance, the former simply reveals the fact that Job cursed the day of his birth and the night of his conception; the latter, however, deals with the ideas underlying the curse. Cursing is a species of magic; the curse is a "spell", and it operates mechanically. Instances from the Scriptures and from the rest of the "Semitic world" may be easily adduced. The subject is justly treated in manuals of biblical

The
Interpretatio
rerum

archæology. The aim of the science of archæology is to recover for us of a latter day a vision of the life of antiquity (specifically of a certain people of antiquity) both in its external forms and in its inward interests. With the adjunct sciences of geography and history, each on a comprehensive scale, it transcends the mere verbal interpretation by placing a literary production in its proper *milieu*, the latter constituting the total complex of conditions by which an author is surrounded and which must be known as fully as possible if the words he spoke and the thoughts he thought are to be adequately understood. We must know the soil he trod on, with its fields and meadows and forests, with its hills and valleys and streams and the sky above them; the country of which he was a citizen, with its constitution and government, its laws and institutions, its courts and parliaments; the nation whose son he was, with all its inherited habits of life and manners of thought, its traditions and beliefs and hopes; the political, social, and cultural atmosphere, which he shared in common with his people at that particular period,—if we wish truly to understand him. For words are abbreviated thoughts, and thought is but an element, become conscious, of the inner life with all its manifold stirrings; as we exchange communications with our fellow-men, we speak as it were in riddles, in hints and allusions, which are at once understood because the entire situation is mentally present to speaker and addressed alike, and the full intent and import are thus supplied above the verbal meaning of the utterance—from the context, the context of pulsating life. This context it is the business of the philologist to reconstruct in its entirety in order that the word snatched therefrom

may be organically co-ordinated with all its parts. Over against the atomistic interpretation of Scriptures, with the arithmetic mean of the total sum of fragments operating as a generic sacred logic, the contextual elucidation must be emphasized, which is indeed truly individual. A mere verbal exposition of a passage like Isaiah 22, 1-14 will at best mean a general and vague reference to *a* battle and *a* war (Rashi). Once we know, or imagine that we know, the exact situation admirably summed up in the concise heading: "Arraignment of the impenitent Jerusalemites during Sennacherib's siege of the capital" (Luzzatto), every word becomes significant, every phrase forceful, and the whole one vivid scene, with the prophet in the center thundering amidst the noisy carousals of his compatriots the message of "a day of trouble, and of trampling, and of perplexity".

**The Contextual
Interpretation
of Scriptures
versus the
Atomistic**

18. Individual as a situation always is, the word spoken therein is supremely so. Though we must know all the cultural forces that go to make an environment, of which naturally the person of the speaker or writer is a part, there must always remain a residuum which baffles analysis and which constitutes the core of human personality⁹⁴. As philologists, we deal with the heroes of mankind, with Goethe and Shakespeare and Dante and Plato and Isaiah. It behooves us to remember that the genius, in employing the native speech of his people, enriches it constantly not only by new coinages, but in particular by endowing old words with new potencies and pouring new wine into old bottles. "*Le style est l'homme même.*" The grammar of the language spoken by Isaiah was forged in the dim past by some Bedouin ancestor; and it is but

**Individualistic
Interpretation**

proper that we ascend to the source and there discern the mechanism in all its parts. But it is equally important, and in the last analysis of the utmost importance, that we seek to ascertain the prophet's own grammar and lexicon, the particular *nuance* given by him to a word or phrase, the thought that underlies a favored expression.⁹⁵ The individual-psychological moment in philological interpretation plays as important a part at least as the grammatical, lexical, and contextual factors previously considered. Even the rabbis set off the verbose Ezekiel against the concise Isaiah;⁹⁶ and no two prophets, we are told, spoke in the same style (בסגנון אחר)⁹⁷.

19. The simple sense with the elucidation of which the philologist is charged is often and rightly contrasted with the allegorical. Allegory is of course a legitimate form of rhetoric. The prophets frequently speak in משלים and חידות of which the solution (נמשל) is sometimes appended, but more often left to the imagination of the hearer or reader. When a writer veils his thoughts in allegorical form, the allegorical method of interpretation is naturally the only admissible one. But where we are reasonably certain that an allegorical meaning was farthest from the mind of the author, the allegorical interpretation may fitly interest the student of the history of exegesis; but for the purpose of understanding the writer it is clearly out of place. For, while the Zohar pronounces a woe upon him who says that there are in Scriptures secular stories and ordinary sayings⁹⁸, the Talmud gives expression to the opinion: "No Scriptural verse may be divested of its simple sense".⁹⁹ Well may the church-fathers point with ridicule to the "carnal"¹⁰⁰ exegesis of the Jews and their adherence

to the "bare letter";¹⁰¹ the rational, i. e., philological, interpretation of the Scriptures, which modern Christian commentators are fond of contrasting with the rabbinic whims and fancies, is rooted in the "mos Iudaicus"¹⁰², that habit of the Jewish mind which, though indulging in the by-ways of homily and mysticism, never lost sight of the one royal road to the understanding of Holy Writ, the sober, simple sense.

20. That verse in the third chapter of Job which has introduced us to so many and important philological operations, will reveal one more. We perceive that Job curses his day. How are we to reconcile that with the character "Job the patient" that we have met with in the preceding two chapters, the Prologue? The discrepancy may, of course, be only a seeming one; that is to say, on deeper insight into the general plan of the work it may be found to have been designed. Or again the difficulty may be real, provided we apply our standards of unity of composition to a Hebraic literary production. It is true that there is such a thing as a universal standard against which no poet, be he ever so ancient or "Oriental", may sin with impunity. But it is equally true that within wide limits standards of literary composition have changed with the times. Or the difficulty may be solved by cutting the Gordian knot: a frequent operation of criticism (higher, literary). Thus, according to Duhm, the poem beginning at chapter 3 and concluding with 42, 6 was worked by the post-exilic author into the older framework, the ancient "Volksbuch" of which the first two chapters and the epilogue (42, 7-17) are at present all that remains, the poem having displaced the intermediate part in which Job defended God's justice against the onslaughts of the three friends and which con-

**The Higher
Criticism
again.
Unity of
Authorship**

cluded with a speech of the Lord commending Job. The figure of Satan, which other scholars regard as unmistakable evidence of post-exilic origin¹⁰³, and the late לְבַב¹⁰⁴ notwithstanding, the "Volksbuch" is placed by Duhm in pre-deuteronomic times. We may realize from this example how ill-informed we are about the succession of religious ideas that what one regards as late is pronounced by another to be old. The same holds good of linguistic observations; for it is quite true that, though a word or a phrase meets us elsewhere in late writings, it may have commenced to be used at a much earlier period. Suffice it to say that the interpreter's task is not complete until he adjusts the single thought to the general scheme of the work, to its

**The Central
Thought of a
Literary Work**

central thought. The whole and the parts—each receives its full meaning when co-ordinated with the other. It is indeed necessary to know the general purport of a book before we can adequately understand the specific chapters and verses. The method of procedure involves a more or less hasty perusal of the parts and a provisional summing up; then from the point of view of the summary, or the questions concerning the general plan, a more painstaking study of the points of detail as they relate to the plan of the whole. For the supreme question is, What is the content of the entire work and what its object? Some may use the scalpel of criticism too freely; but all of us must seek to penetrate into the innermost thought of the author, the whole thought, the larger meaning. If we proceed in our criticism sanely and with a conservative bias, we shall establish unity of thought by subtle psychologic processes, and show that the unity was original, despite seeming in-

congruities; or if we be chary of harmonistic devices, we shall with the radicals pronounce the unity to be the work of an "editor", and several unities will result; in our case, the unity of the "Volksbuch", and the unity of the poem dovetailed into the framework. From the point of view of criticism, whether we agree with its results or not, a chapter like the first of Genesis assumes a variety of aspects, the sense varying according as we interpret the creation hymn in its early mythical form, then the story as it was told at the Israelitish sanctuaries, then the narrative as it first assumed literary form, and lastly the semi-rationalistic, semi-theological account as we read it now at the opening of the Pentateuch. This, it is true, is vastly more than the ordinary "literary" criticism connotes. Very important is the sense of an omission, of that which with the progress of ideas was cut out, eliminated. The philologist thus would read behind the lines and view Scripture in a chronological perspective with its parts located in superimposed planes. Important, however, as the critical regress to beginning is, the student cannot be too earnestly warned against a sin of omission which is quite frequent in critical works, the forgetting of the converse process of progression towards the form assumed under the hands of the final "redactor". And the very last redactor was the instinct of the Jewish people that made the canon; and it made the canon by exclusion no less than by inclusion. For in constituting the canon the Jewish people with no mean effort of exegetical skill,—and there is really none higher,—summed up the content of Scriptural thought, of

Original and
Editorial
Unity

The Multiple
Sense of
Scripture on a
Chronological
Basis

The Goal of
Biblical
Philology

the Scriptural *Weltanschauung*, the presentation of which must forever mark the goal of Biblical philology.

21. A question quite pertinent is how far the philologist must identify himself with his subject. If "Nachempfind-

**Assent to the
Scriptural
Weltanschauung
a Prerequisite
of Exegetical
Success**

ung" be the essence of philology, it would seem impossible without a full measure of identification of interests. Yet this identification may be merely fictitious: we may for the time being feel with the ancient author and think his thoughts and share his beliefs and hopes, but all this may be a part we play after the fashion of the actor who beneath the assumed personality retains his own¹⁰⁵. Is this dual personality an exegetical possibility? A possibility it is to be sure, but it cannot minister to success. For objectivity is just as much endangered by a hostile as by a friendly attitude. *Tertium non datur*. The impartial mind is, as a rule, the indifferent one, and indifference is a species of hostility. I take it that assent to the Scriptural *Weltanschauung* is a prerequisite of exegetical success in the highest sense of the word¹⁰⁶. And if I may be permitted to express the same thought in different words, only a Jew who knows himself at one with the Biblical religion can adequately interpret the Scriptures. Surely a poet is the poet's best interpreter, and a philosopher the philosopher's. In the same manner it requires a religious mind to understand psalmist and prophet, and only he that is nurtured by Jewish thought, itself rooted in the Scriptures, may hope to master the Scriptural Word in its fullest and deepest import. Only a Jew can say on approaching Holy Writ: This is flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bones. He must possess himself, it is true, of the philological method and of the completest apparatus; but he alone can add thereto that which ensures fullest comprehension: the love

for his own, for the thought that makes his innermost soul to throb, which still lives in him albeit faintly, so that his understanding of the Scriptures, mediated though it be by philological effort, becomes to a considerable extent indeed immediate, just as the language of Scriptures is to him in a large measure a living tongue.

22. A word concerning the art of constructing a commentary and concerning translations. A commentary may either choose to present the entire apparatus, or else give only results. Even in presenting the entire apparatus, it is not necessary to carry the reader into the workshop

How to Write
a Commentary
or a Trans-
lation

with all its chaos of open books. A principle of selection will become imperative. It is certainly a weariness of the flesh to wade through bulky commentaries with their interminable parentheses and with all the history of the interpretation of a single verse unrolled in a manner so baffling, so perplexing. Not everything that has been printed is relevant; and this applies to ancients and moderns alike. *Φιλολογία* is not necessarily *πολυλογία*. A few representatives judiciously selected will more than balance an army of would-be exegetes and critics. When again a commentary is written for a wider circle, it need not be shallow. It may quite as much represent endless toil which, however, should be wisely kept in the background. It must above all refrain from forcing the passage to be interpreted. An honest statement of the difficulties is worth more than abortive attempts at explanation. We must be ashamed of individual ignorance; but it is our plain duty to share in the general ignorance. Translations are, of course, intended for the widest circles. The translator must guard against the pitfalls of literalism¹⁰⁷ and paraphrase¹⁰⁸ alike. The most perfect translation, of course, is that which initiates

all the ambiguities of the original without introducing fresh ones; a truly delicate task. There are obviously cases in which such endeavor would baffle the most expert skill. Translation then becomes an abbreviated commentary; a commentary, moreover, which registers mere results. The translator should therefore resist the temptation of brilliancy at the expense of truth. As a rule, he will acquiesce in the probable rather than risk novelties. There is much in the history of Biblical interpretation that is ephemeral; a translation destined for the people must seek to embody that which is most universally acknowledged; nay, it should be a good deal behind the times. Whereas a translation for the use of the scholar may indulge in all the signs of the critical apparatus and indicate *lacunae* where the translator must, according to strict rules of science, refrain from translating, a popular translation clearly must be consecutive. The Bible, moreover, must be translated as a unit, as it left the hands of the last redactor, as it was gathered into a canon; for surely in a translation one cannot superimpose one stratum upon another. It may be even questionable whether a margin with alternate renderings, or with references to the versions or other "ancient authorities", or with the more literal rendering for the free one in the text, after the fashion of the two historical English Versions, is desirable; for in none of the classes mentioned can there be any attempt at exhaustive treatment. The case, of course, is different when the translation is accompanied by a commentary; then such matter may conveniently be located in the latter. The diction of the translation should accommodate itself to the original; poetry should be rendered in an elevated style, and uncommon Hebrew words by corresponding uncommon English words. In this respect the English Versions are capable of improve-

ment, much as the general style and manner of the Authorized Version must remain forever the starting-point of any new attempt. For, the more we study the English of our Bible, the more we realize the existence of a distinct sacred language which stands quite apart and is still understood in all its niceties by the educated. The sacredness of the original has communicated itself to its versions; the English Bible of 1611 is a classic in English literature quite as much as the original is in Jewish literature.

NOTES

¹ Edited by Bratuscheck, Leipzig, 1877.

² Second edition, Paris, 1907.

³ Whitney, *The Life and Growth of Language*, 1899, 315.

⁴ Compare the title of Mr. Giles' work, "Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students" (first edition, 1895); in its German translation it was made to read "*Vergleichende Grammatik der Klassischen Sprachen*" (Leipzig, 1896). Compare also Max Müller, *passim*; Whitney, *l. c.*

⁵ The birth of philology in the modern sense of the word, it has been said, dates from April 8, 1777, when F. A. Wolf registered in the University of Göttingen as *studiosus philologiae*. From 1783 to 1790, Wolf delivered in Halle a series of lectures on the Encyclopaedia and Methodology of Classical Studies, the first of which was announced as "*Encyclopaedia philologica, in qua, orbe universo earum rerum, quibus litterae antiquitatis continentur, peragrato, singularum doctrinarum ambitus, argumenta, coniunctiones, utilitates, subsidia, denique recte et cum fructu tractandae cuiusque rationes illustrabuntur*". In an essay printed in the first volume of the "Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft" (1807; reprinted in his "Kleine Schriften," II, 1869, 808 ff.), he defines "Alterthumswissenschaft," i. e. (classical) philology, as the "Inbegriff der Kenntnisse und Nachrichten, die uns mit den Handlungen und Schicksalen, mit dem politischen, gelehrten und häuslichen Zustande der Griechen und Römer, mit ihrer Cultur, ihren Sprachen, Künsten und Wissenschaften, Sitten, Religionen, National-Charakteren und Denkart bekannt machen, dergestalt dass wir geschickt werden die von ihnen auf uns gekommenen Werke gründlich zu verstehen und mit Einsicht in ihren Inhalt und Geist, mit Vergegenwärtigung des alterthümlichen Lebens und Vergleichung des spätern und des heutigen, zu geniessen". The goal of all such study, "das letzte Ziel," is "kein anderes als die Kenntniss der alterthümlichen Menschheit selbst, welche Kenntniss aus der durch das Studium der alten Ueberreste bedingten Beobachtung einer organisch entwickelten bedeutungsvollen Nationalbildung hervorgeht". As Prof. Oertel (Lectures on the Study

of Language, 1902, 10) aptly remarks, "Wolf conceived of Philology as the Biography of a Nation". The Wolfian definition was somewhat modified by the great philologist Boeckh; to him philology is neither archæology, nor linguistic study, nor criticism, nor history of literature, but its sole task consists in the cognition of that which the human mind has produced, ("das Erkennen des vom menschlichen Geist Producirten"). Boeckh's definition has become the common property of philologists, though here and there it has undergone a slight rephrasing. Thus, in the opening pages of Iwan Müller's "Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft", I, we read: "Die Philologie hat die wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis des fremden Geistes zum Ziel, wie er sich unter bestimmten Verhältnissen einzeln und in Gemeinschaft verkörpert und in bleibenden Denkmälern ausgeprägt hat: sie ist also wesentlich Wiedererkenntnis und Aneignung". Similarly Reinach (*l. c.*, 1): "La philologie embrasse l'étude de toutes les manifestations de l'esprit humain dans l'espace et dans le temps".

⁶ On the subject of gesture-language comp. Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, 1899, 60 ff.; Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie I = Die Sprache I* (1900), 131 ff.

⁷ So Boeckh (*l. c.*, 11): "Sieht man auf das Wesen der philologischen Thätigkeit selbst, indem man alle willkürlich und empirisch gesetzten Schranken wegnimmt und der Betrachtung die höchste Allgemeinheit giebt, so ist die Philologie—oder, was dasselbe sagt, die Geschichte, *Erkenntnis des Erkannten*".

⁸ "La méthode de recherche de l'histoire, c'est la philologie." "La linguistique, la numismatique, l'archéologie, la critique verbale, l'histoire des arts, des religions, des usages populaires, des faits économiques, des faits politiques, tout cela est tout entier dans l'histoire; donc tout cela est tout entier dans la philologie" (L. Havet in: *Revue politique et littéraire*, 16 Mai 1885, 633 ff.). In history, the same scholar continues, "la méthode ici existe, mais elle se dissimule".

⁹ Comp. Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1894: "die eine (= Naturforschung) sucht Gesetze, die andere (= Geschichte) Gestalten".

¹⁰ "Kunstgriffe," as Windelband (*l. c.*) expresses himself.

¹¹ "Verstehen schlechthin ist allgemein menschlich, wie sprechen und mittheilen..... Von diesem gemeinen Verstehen unterscheidet sich das philologische vor allem durch die künstliche Herbeiführung aller der Bedingungen, unter denen allein das Verständniss möglich ist" (H. Steinthal, *Die Arten und Formen der Interpretation*, in: *Verhandlungen der 32. Philologenversammlung*, 1878, 25 ff.).

¹² "Der Philologe versteht den Redner und Dichter besser als dieser sich selbst und besser als ihn die Zeitgenossen schlechthin verstanden haben: denn er macht klar bewusst, was in jenem nur unmittelbar und thatsächlich vorlag" (Steinthal, *l. c.*, 29).

also Mishna and Baraita sporadically. Care must be had, however, lest the Mishnic use is itself derived from the Biblical phrase.

⁴⁵ E. g., the names of precious stones, zoological and botanical names, or the catalogue of articles of finery in the third chapter of Isaiah on which a theologian has written a work consisting of three volumes.

⁴⁶ Recourse was had to certain persons (the maidservant in the house of Rabbi) with whom Hebrew was still a living language; or to a Bedouin.

⁴⁷ Witness the disagreement. Very often they probably acquiesced in a *quid pro quo* or an approximate rendering after the manner of the Authorized Version; compare, for example, the word *gourd*.

⁴⁸ So Ibn Koreish.

⁴⁹ Principally Ibn Janah.

⁵⁰ Jerome found Latin words in the Scriptures.

⁵¹ But not necessarily so in primitive stages: the feminine suffix *-a* in the Indo-European languages is said to have come about in imitation of the word for *wife, woman*, whose root happened to end in *-a*; see Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II 1 (1899), 100 f.

⁵² So the case-endings which primitive Hebrew possessed are absent in historical Hebrew; the same has happened, for instance, also in English.

⁵³ At any rate conventionally; properly it should form a grammatical division by itself, and the syntax should be made to begin with the combination of sentences into a period.

⁵⁴ Nominal and verbal clauses; asseverative, negative, interrogative, etc.

⁵⁵ *Pre—*, after the manner of Sweet, is with me an abbreviation for: the form of the verb made with formative *prefixes*. König calls it the Yaktul form. The ordinary name "imperfect" labels it after one of its functions, and moreover has no place in the morphology where forms should be classified as forms, and not according to their function.

⁵⁶ אִזְּ יִשִּׁיר, כִּרְם יִהְיֶה.

⁵⁷ The Assyrian so-called preterite (*ikšad, ikšud*) is identical in form with the Hebrew imperfect (יִמְלֹךְ for instance). Apparently in the primitive Semitic language the pre-form was indifferent as to the time; in the historical languages it was, therefore, free to develop into a preterite (as in Assyrian) or into a subjunctive (as in Ethiopic). Hebrew itself leads to the same conclusion. Simple preterital traces have been preserved in אִזְּ יִקְהַל which is in no wise different from וַיִּקְהַל; that is to say, the aoristic force does not lie in the verbal form, but in the accompanying adverb of time אִזְּ and its equivalent וַיִּ. The Greek aorist itself, we are told, originated in the same manner. The preterital force belongs to the augment (ἐ) which originally was an adverb of time, = *then*, to which the verbal form was joined enclitically. With augmentless forms the temporal force likewise came from the context and was not inherent in the verbal form (see Brugmann,

l. c., II 2 (1892), 859 f., 866 ff.; *Griechische Grammatik*, 3d ed., 1900, 262-267. Even the accentual conditions of the Greek compound which we call aorist seem to have prevailed in primitive Hebrew: *wa yaḥhil* (hence the loss of the final vowel and the shortening of the stem-vowel in the ensuing closed syllable; hence in the case of an open penult, the accent rests there even in historical times: *wa-yyāḥem*. See the writer's "Notes on Semitic Grammar III", *AJSL.*, XIX (1902), 46, n. 4.

⁵⁵ Comp. והלילה אמר in the second half of the verse.

⁵⁰ See Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, 451, n. 1.

⁶⁰ Comp. Menahem Ibn Sarūk. s. v. זר; Ibn Ezra and Rashi, *passim*.

⁶¹ This complement may be omitted in prose, and certainly in poetry.

⁶² Niddah 16 b.

⁶³ See Cornill, *Ezechiel*, 123. But also in the other versions; comp. the writer's "Character of the Anonymous Greek Version of Habakkuk, chapter 3" in: *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, I (1908), 135 f.

⁶⁴ Material may be found in the works of Malbim and Ehrlich; to be used with caution.

⁶⁵ פשטות מתחדשים בכל-יום. Comp. Rashbam, ed. Rosin, 1881, 49 (on Gen. 37, 2).

⁶⁶ As if אמר could be construed over הרה with גבר and as if אמר גבר were tantamount to אמר לגבר!

⁶⁷ "Man sollte dem Dichter, trotz seiner unleugbaren Neigung für das Überladene, nicht den Verstoß gegen das einfachste ästhetische Empfinden zuschreiben, zwei so ganz verschiedene Objekte mit einander zu verbinden."

⁶⁸ עבר אבי את-אמי.

⁶⁹ The meaning: *point* may itself be secondary, derived from the primary signification: *throw, shoot*, in which sense we find both the simple stem and the causative (I Sam. 20, 36). Of course, we are treading on unsafe ground; the etymology of תורה is involved, about which there have been many guesses (Assyrian *ārū* "lead, guide", and *tērtu* "law" is compared by some scholars). But ירה, הורה apparently has also the meaning: *throw water, rain*; hence מורה the early rain, = יורה which is a nominal form of the type *yaf'al*. Others again distinguish three different roots ירה: (1) *throw*, comp. Ethiopic *warawa*, modern Arabic *warra*; (2) causative = *moisten*, a by-form of רוה, comp. for the transposition יען and עון for example; (3) causative = *teach*. From the sense *moisten* we would obtain: *fructify*.

⁷⁰ With the ך properly geminated, compensative production.

⁷¹ It has been said that "there is no manuscript so old as common sense".

⁷² Autograph or immediate transcript, sometimes prepared by an amanuensis at dictation, compare Baruch and Jeremiah.

⁷³ Compare the תקוני סופרים for example.

⁷⁴ Scribal errors, graphic or auricular; change of script from the Old Hebrew to the square; dittography; haplography; aberration of the eye to a line above or below; lacunae; illegibility of the "Vorlage"; etc.

⁷⁵ E. g. Chronicles compared with the sources (Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings); deuterographs; הנסחא השנית, as Ibn Janah expresses himself.

⁷⁶ J. Reach, *Die Schirin der Massoreten von Tiberias*, 1895.

⁷⁷ Ellipsis, pleonasm, etc.

⁷⁸ Marginal (*masora parva*, *masora magna*) or systematic (*masora finalis*, אכלה ואכלה).

⁷⁹ 'Aruk, Rashi and others. Thus, for example, Pesahim 113 *a* the editions and the two Munich MSS. read פשוט, whereas 'Aruk has נשוט (comp. Syriac) which reading is also found in the Columbia College MS. described by the writer in his "The Columbia College MS. of Meghilla", 1892, 1.

⁸⁰ Gaonic Responsa; so Sanhedrin 106 *a* we find in the *Tešubot ha-geonim*, ed. Harkavy, the reading איוון which is explicitly interpreted as a Persian feminine proper name for א(י)וון of the editions and the Munich (cod. 95) and Karlsruhe MSS., an impossible grammatical form.

⁸¹ The comparatively small number of variants in the Pentateuch, for example, need not be taken as a proof of originality.

⁸² Rabinovicz; but see the writer's remarks in *TLZ.*, 1908, 610 f., and in the Preface to his *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud*, 1910.

⁸³ See the writer's "Commentarius Isaacidis, etc.", 1891, 1 ff.

⁸⁴ The efforts of Baer and Ginsburg (not to mention their predecessors) notwithstanding.

⁸⁵ Comp. Norzi, *passim*.

⁸⁶ See on Zechar. 14, 5.

⁸⁷ See a series of articles by the writer in *ZAW.*, XXV (1905), 311-319; XXVI (1906), 85-89; XXVII (1907), 212-270; *AJSL.*, XXII (1906), 110-115; XXV (1909), 33-61.

⁸⁸ Male child as in Hebrew בן זכר Jerem. 20, 15.

⁸⁹ The reference to the conception; גבר *vir adultus*.

⁹⁰ Comp. the Concordance.

⁹¹ **M** = Masoretic note; Heb. = the Hebrew text in adequate translation; **Σ** = Symmachus; **Ⲛ** = Syriac Version; **V** = Vulgate; **T** = Targum; **Ⲙ** = Septuagint.

⁹² "Man findet gewöhnlich in Hi 3 ff., eine grössere poetische Kraft als in Jer 20, 14 ff.; auf mich machen die schmuckloseren, naiveren Schmerzensausbrüche Jeremias einen ergreifenderen Eindruck, als die kunstvollere Nachahmung, die überlegter, aber etwas überladen und kalt ist."

⁹³ Duhm's rendering.

⁹⁴ See Steinthal, *l. c.*, 31 f.

⁹⁵ For instance, *the Holy One of Israel*.

⁹⁶ Hagigah 13 b.

⁹⁷ Sanhedrin 89 a.

⁹⁸ וי' להווא בר נש דאמר דהא אורייתא אתא לאחזאה סיפורין בעלמא ומלין
(Zohar on Num. 9, 1). דהריומי

⁹⁹ אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו (Shabbat 63 a).

¹⁰⁰ Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph., c. 14: ὑμεῖς πάντα σαρκικῶς νοοῦκατε.

¹⁰¹ Origen, De principiis, liber iv: ψιλὸν γράμμα.

¹⁰² Jerome, Epist. 64, c. 9: "antequam mysticam scruter intelligentiam, more Iudaico quae scripta sunt simpliciter exponam."

¹⁰³ It occurs for the first time in Zechariah!

¹⁰⁴ 2, 10, 10; elsewhere Prov. 19, 20; Ezra 8, 30; Esther 4, 4; 9, 23, 27; I Chron. 12, 19; II Chron. 29, 16, 22; comp. Abot 1, 1 and elsewhere frequently.

¹⁰⁵ Littré has said somewhere: "Il faut que le coeur devienne ancien parmi les anciennes choses, et la plénitude de l'histoire ne se dévoile qu'à celui qui descend, ainsi disposé, dans le passé. Mais il faut que l'esprit demeure moderne, et n'oublie jamais qu'il n'y a pour lui d'autre foi que la foi scientifique."

¹⁰⁶ Comp. Luzzatto's Introduction to his Commentary on Isaiah.

¹⁰⁷ After the manner of Aquila.

¹⁰⁸ In the style of the Targum.

TWO MEMORIAL LISTS FROM THE GENIZAH

BY JULIUS H. GREENSTONE, Gratz College

EVERY department of Jewish and general Semitic learning has been considerably enriched by the literary treasures yielded by the Cairo Genizah. Valuable additions have been made to the knowledge of Hebrew and Arabic grammar and lexicography, Bible exegesis and Talmudic lore, Jewish liturgy, philosophy, law and customs. Jewish history, however, was probably the greatest gainer by this wonderful discovery. Outside of the fact that all these branches of Jewish literature throw light on the life and habits of the people living at the time when these were written or compiled, we find in the Genizah a number of documents which are purely or mainly of an historical nature and which reveal to us many facts and conditions that were entirely unknown to the historian. Some chapters of Jewish history will have to be completely rewritten and others must undergo revision when all the Genizah fragments are deciphered and made accessible to the student.

By far the most noted contribution to Jewish history was made by the discovery and publication by Dr. S. Schechter, of the *Megillat Ebyathar*, by which we are informed for the first time of the existence of a line of Geonim in Palestine and Egypt, even after the Babylonian academies had been closed and the office of the Gaonate there ceased forever. The student of Jewish history,

who was hitherto accustomed to pass rapidly from the Orient to Moorish Spain, accompanied on his journey by some romantic tales, will now have to stop for a while in Palestine and in Egypt, where he will meet with a large array of names and titles borne by Jewish notables and with a literature that will repay careful study and investigation. The *Megillah*, which narrates the contention that existed in 1083 between the Gaon Ebyathar and the exilarch David concerning the religious jurisdiction over the Jews of Egypt and Palestine, contains sufficient data for the reconstruction of that period of Jewish history, extending over a century, when this important family of Geonim held ecclesiastical dominion over the Jews of these two countries. Prof. W. Bacher actually attempted such a reconstruction in an article published in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW (vol. XV, pp. 79-96). This, however, may have been somewhat premature; many changes will have to be made therein on the basis of documents subsequently published by Poznański, Cowley and others. Some years will yet pass before an accurate presentation of the history of the Jews in Egypt during the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries will be constructed from the many Genizah fragments which are now in the possession of the great libraries of Europe and America and of a number of individuals. While the value of these fragments for a better understanding of Jewish history is fully appreciated by Jewish scholars, the labor connected with deciphering the time-worn and frequently illegible manuscripts and the paucity of workers in this field of learning are causing a regrettable delay in the progress of publication.

The two following texts are from the collection of Genizah fragments in the possession of David Werner

Amram, Esq., of Philadelphia, to whom I hereby offer my thanks for permitting their publication.

No. I

This consists of one leaf, $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 8 inches, written on both sides of the paper, in two columns, in a square Hebrew script with a strong turn to cursive. The text is unfortunately in a very poor condition, badly faded in a number of places and one corner entirely gone. The lines or words that are illegible are marked here by dots, while those words whose reading is conjectured are enclosed in brackets.

The manuscript represents a memorial prayer, probably read in the synagogue on certain occasions in memory of the illustrious dead. That this custom prevailed in the Jewish community of Egypt is evident from three fragments published by Dr. M. Gaster, in "*Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann*" (Breslau, 1900, Nos. XV, XVI, XVII, pp. 241-2) and by others in various periodicals, as well as by another fragment in the Amram collection which will be given later. The list given here is of special interest, since it contains many names of persons that evidently occupied important positions in the Egyptian Jewish community. Many of these names are also met with in other documents coming from the Genizah, as will be indicated in the notes. Of special interest is the division into families and the titles attached to each name. It is possible that this prayer was in use in the Cairo Jewish congregations during the life-time of Maimonides, since the names mentioned at the end of each list, especially that at the end of the third list, are of men who lived somewhat prior to the date of the great savant.

As far as could be made out from this very imperfect document, there are here five distinct lists of names. The

first list, extending from line 1 to line 16 on the first column, contains the names of the members of the illustrious priestly family, who presided over the Yeshibah *Geon Jacob* from about 1046 to about 1131. Here we meet again with those familiar names found in a number of fragments, many of which were published by Schechter, Poznański, Worman and others. First comes Solomon, apparently the founder of this Gaonic dynasty, then his two sons, Joseph and Elijah, Ebyathar, the son of Elijah, the author of the famous *Megillah*, then comes Elijah, the fourth in the academy, then Solomon, a brother of Ebyathar, although not so designated, and, last, Mazliah, son of Solomon, also not designated as such, with whom this line of Geonim seems to come to a close.

The second list beginning with line 17, column I, and extending to line 9, column II, apparently contains the names of the leaders in the Cairo Yeshibah. The superscription of this list is illegible and the names cannot be identified with any degree of certainty. The first name mentioned is that of Abraham, the head of the academy *Geon Jacob*, a title borne by the heads of the Palestinian academy, which is rather puzzling in this case. Next comes his son Josiah, entitled the chief of the court of justice. The upper left corner of the second column is torn off, so that the first three lines cannot be read. The next name is that of Zadok, then comes his son Moses, "the mighty Prince, the intelligent judge, the foundation of the rule, the glory of the academy", then his son Josiah, "the honored Prince, the glory of the academy". This ends the list of names of the members of this illustrious family.

The third list, extending from line 10, column II, to line 10, column III, contains the names of a family of

Negidim. About seven lines of this list are illegible, a fact greatly to be regretted since this might have been of great assistance in unraveling the obscurity in which the history of the Egyptian Negidim is still shrouded. The names that can be read with certainty are those of Meborach, his son Saadia, and his son Judah the Nagid. Lines 17 and 18 are illegible; line 19 has the name of Saadia, and then the rest of the column is entirely faded. On column III, we meet first with the names of Moses and of his two sons, Meborach and Judah, and then of Nathaniel.

The fourth list, beginning with line 11, and ending with line 20 of column III, contains the names of an illustrious family of Hachamim, probably judges or assistants in the court of justice. Only two of these names could be deciphered, the first and the last, both being that of Isaac.

The fifth list, beginning with line 21, column III, and ending with line 11, column IV, contains the names of prominent men in the Cairo community, the superscription of this list, however, being again illegible. The first name is that of Solomon, "the fifth", the next name is illegible. On column IV, we read the names of Yahia (?), Dosa, Josiah, Isaiah, Shemaryahu and Ephraim. In the upper left hand corner of this column there is added the name of Joseph, apparently by the same hand.

Then begins the prayer for the congregation, of which only one line is left, and in which we might have expected to find the name of the Nagid then ruling. Of interest is the reference to resurrection in the first and third lists.

COLUMN I

ישר

1 דוכרן טב לניחי נפשתא לזכר גאוני

2 וראשי ישיבותיהם ואבות בתי דיניהם

אשר נהגו שררה בעם יו עד כגק מרינו	3
ורבינו אדוננו שלמה הכהן ראש ישיבת	4
גאון יעקב וחמודו אליהו הכהן ראש	5
ישיבת גאון יעקב ואחיו יהוסף הכהן אב	6
בית דין של כל ישראל וחמודו אביתר	7
הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב וחמודו	8
אליהו הכהן הרביעי בחבורה וכגק	9
אדוננו שלמה הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון	10
אדוננו	
יעקב זצל זכר חסיד מצליח זכר	11
כגק מרנו ורבינו אדוננו מצליח הכהן	12
ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב וכלל נפטרי	13
המשפחה המיוחסת הזאת רוח יו (תניחם)	14
תהא עמידתם בקרוב יטה עליהם	15
השלום ועל ... ם ... שלום	16
ועוד.....	17
וראשי.....	18
ישיבותיהם ואדון בתי דיניהם אשר	19
נהגו שררה בעם יו עד (כגק מרנו)	20
ורבינו אדוננו אברהם ראש (ישיבת)	21
גאון יעקב וכלל חמודיו הנח(מדים עד)	22
כגק מרנו ורבינו אדוננו יאשי(הו)	23
הצדיק אב בית דין	24

COLUMN II

של כל ישראל.....	1
האדיר.....	2
אדוננו צדוק.....	3

של כל ישראל.....וחמודו כגק....	4
ורבנו משה השר האדיר הדיין המיש(כיל)	5
יסוד המשרה תפארת הישיבה וחמודו	6
כגק מרנ ורבנא יאשיהו השר הנכ פאר	7
הישיבה וכלל נפטרי המשפחה המיוחסת	8
הזאת וכול	9
ועוד דוכרן טב	10
לנוחי נפשתא לזכר המשפחות המיוחסות	11
משפחת נגדי ישראל ואיתניהם עד כגק	12
מרנו ורבנו מבורך צורבא מרבנן וחמודו	13
(כגק) מרנו ורבנו סעדיהו השר האדיר	14
בישראל וחמודו כגק מרנו ורבנו אדוננו	15
יהודה הנגיד.....	16
.....	17
.....	18
וחמודו כגק מרנו ורבנו סעדיהו השר האדיר	19
.....	20
.....	21
.....	22
.....	23
.....	24

COLUMN III

נו אדוננו משה	1
ים ונגיד הנגידים	2
חמודיו השרים	3
כגק מרנו ורבנו מבורך השר האדיר	4
בישראל ואחיו כגק מרנו ורבנו יהודה	5

6	השר האדיר בישראל וכנגד מרנו ורבנו
7	נתנאל השר האדיר ראש (המשרה)
8	בחיר הוישיבה וכלל נפטרי (המשפחה)
9	המיוחסת הזאת (רוח יוֹ תניחם ותהא)
10	עמידתם בקרוב וג
11	ועוד דוכרן טב לנוחי נפשתא לזכר
12	המשפחות המיוחסות משפחת הח(כמים)
13	הגדולים בישראל עד כנגד מרנו ורבנו (יצחק)
14	הדיון המשכיל המופלא החכם (ראש)
15	בית דין הגון וכנגד מרנו ורבנו.....
16	השר הגדול בישראל (וכנגד) מרנו ורבנו
17	יצחק הרב הגדול.....
18הנפשות
19הוישיבה..... וכלל נפטרי
20	המשפחה המיוחסת.....
21	ועוד דוכרן טב (לנוחי נפשתא) לזכר
22	המשפחות המיוחסות.....
23	עד כנגד מרנו ורבנו (שלמה) החמישי
24	בחבורה הדיון המשכיל.....
25	הש(רי)ם עד כנגד מרנו ורבנו.....
26	הדיון המשכיל המופלא החכם (ראש)
27	בית דין הגון וחמודו כנגד מרנו

COLUMN IV

1	יח. י הלוי השר האדיר נזר הלויים וכנגד
2	מרנו ורב דוכא השר האדיר בישראל
3	החכ והגב וכנגד מרנ ורב יאשיהו השר
4	האדיר בישראל וכנגד מרנ ורב ישעיהו

וכנס	השר	(רצפ)	השר) האדיר וכן מרג ורבנ שמריהו	5
כחנא	האדיר	השר	השר האדיר הח והנ וכן מרג ורבנ	6
ורבנא	האדיר	השר	(אפרים) השר הנב וכלל המתערבים	7
ורבנא	האדיר	השר	(עמם) באבל הזה האלהים יסיר יגונם	8
ורבנא	האדיר	השר	וג	9
ורבנא	האדיר	השר	ויברך (אלהינו) וישמור ויעזור את כלל	10
ורבנא	האדיר	השר	

NOTES

- Col. I, 1. 4. שלמה, identical with Solomon ben Yehudah, chief of the Synagogue in Palestine, in 1046, comp. Bacher, *JQR.*, XV, p. 81, and Schechter, *Saadyana*, p. 81, n. 1, and many other places; comp. Epstein, in *Monatsschrift*, XLVII, p. 345, but see Poznański in his "Schechter's Saadyana" and in *REJ.*, XLVIII, p. 151 ff., and LI, p. 52 ff.; see also my "Turkoman Defeat at Cairo", p. 27, n. 30, and Worman, in *JQR.*, XIX, pp. 724-727, Nos. VII-XVI.
1. 5. אליהו, Gaon in Palestine, 1062-1084; Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 81, n. 1, p. 88, l. 8, 16, p. 114, l. 6; see Epstein, *Monatsschrift*, XLVII, p. 345, concerning a responsum of Elijah and his son Ebyathar to Meshulam b. Moses of Mayence.
1. 6. יהוסף, Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 88, l. 8, 11, 14; see my "Turkoman Defeat at Cairo", pp. 17-18, where I endeavored to establish that this Joseph never occupied the position of the chief of the Academy and died in his position as אב בית דין. Poznański, in a private communication, as well as in a letter to the *AJSL.*, April, 1906, agrees with my proposition; see also Worman, *l. c.*, No. I, and Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 81, n. 1, where Joseph has only the title of בית דין כהן צרק.
1. 7. אביהר, see Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 80, n. 3, and references there quoted. In a fragment of a Kaddish published by Schechter, in "*Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann*" (Hebrew part, p. 53), this Ebyathar is mentioned with the same title as here, Solomon Hakohen is designated as אב הישיבה and Zadok as בחבורה השלישי. Solomon is probably identical with the one mentioned here in 1.10,

who became Gaon after the death of his brother, comp. Worman, *l. c.*, p. 723, n. 4.

1. 9. אליהו, possibly identical with the one mentioned *apud* Schechter, *l. c.* XLIV, l. 4, who flourished about 1111. Comp. Bacher, *l. c.*, p. 95, and *REJ.*, XXX, p. 235, see also *ib.* LI, p. 53. Although he never held the position of Gaon, he is still included in this list as is also Joseph the רב בית דין. Regarding the title רביעי בחבורה see Bacher, *JQR.*, XV, pp. 82-83, and Schechter, *l. c.*, No. XXXVIII, p. 2, l. 18, 19.
1. 10. שלמה, son of Elijah, brother of Ebyathar, see Schechter, *l. c.*, No. XXXVIII, p. 2, l. 18, and XLIII, l. 1, Bacher, *l. c.*, p. 83.
1. 11. I do not quite understand the meaning of the phrase זכר חסיד אדוננו מצליח. The word אדוננו is written over the line and then crossed out. It is possible that the writer made a mistake here, beginning the name מצליח, but forgetting to mention the words כג"ק מרנו ורבנו.
1. 12. מצליח, son of Solomon, lived at Fostat in 1131; see Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 81, n. 1, No. XLIII, l. 6, No. XLIV, l. 10; Bacher, *l. c.*, p. 94. Dr. Schechter kindly called my attention to a note in Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog d. hebr. Bibelhandschriften d. k. Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*, vol. I, part 2, p. 273, Codex B. 19a: קנה זה המצחף כגקמ ור אדוננו מצליח הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב יברכהו אלהינו וישמרהו | בר כגקמ ור אדוננו שלמה הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב ולחיה נין הגאונים בממונו לנפשו מאת | כגק המיטביל החכם והנבון יוסף הנודע בן סוגר בחדש תמוז שנת א'תמ"ו לשטרות האלהים יזכהו להנות | בו הוא ובניו | זרעם כל ימיהם לקיים לא ימוש מפיד וג'.

The date given here, Sel. 1446, corresponds to the year 1135; comp. Worman, *l. c.*, p. 723, No. I.

1. 21. אברהם. It is possible that this list, the superscription of which is unfortunately illegible, contains the names of men prominent in the most important Yeshibah of Fostat, also apparently members of one family. That the Yeshibah should be designated by the same name borne by the Palestinian Yeshibah, is not at all strange. Benjamin of Tudela, in enumerating the academies of Bagdad, names the first and largest academy ישיבת גאון יעקב (ed. Adler, p. 39). It is possible then that the largest academy in any town

was known by that name. Bacher (*l. c.*, p. 86, n. 6), also hints at the possibility that the heads of the Egyptian community were designated as Geonim.

This Abraham could not be identified with the one mentioned *apud* Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 81, n. 1, and Worman, *l. c.*, p. 723, No. I, to whom Mazliah addressed a letter in 1131, because the date of this Abraham, being the first in the list, must be placed somewhere in the first half of the eleventh century.

After writing the above, Dr. A. Marx kindly called my attention to an entry in the recently published Neubauer-Cowley *Catalogue of the Bodleian Manuscripts* (Col. 368 f, Cod. Heb. b. II, No. 23), where the following occurs: חכמי ישראל ורבניהם ואבות.... בתי דינים אשר נהגו שררה בעם יו צבאות עד כגן..... אברהם ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב.....

יאשיהו, probably father of Zadok; comp. Schechter, *l. c.* No. 1. 23. XXXVIII, p. 2, l. 18, where Josiah is called אב, no doubt an abbreviation of אב בית דין. Schechter's statement that Zadok was invested with the title of אב (p. 82), has been corrected by Bacher, *l. c.*, p. 82, n. 4. אב was the title of his father Josiah, as the ז"ל after אב indicates, while Zadok was then appointed שלישי having been promoted from his position as רביעי. In the Kaddish published by Schechter in the *Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch*, referred to above, Zadok is also called שלישי, at the time when Ebyathar was already ראש and Solomon אב. Worman, *l. c.*, p. 731, No. XXX, quotes a letter written by a Josiah who calls himself ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב. We should be grateful for the publication of this letter in full.

צדוק, probably son of Josiah, who was appointed שלישי by Elijah, Col. II, l. 3. at the time of the great assembly at Tyre, in 1082, and who so successfully championed the cause of the Gaonic family against the exilarch David in 1093. See Schechter, *l. c.*, No. XXXVIII, p. 2, l. 18; Bacher, *l. c.*, pp. 82-83; *Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch*, Hebrew part, p. 57.

משה, son of Zadok. The title השר האדיר appended to his name, l. 5. and that of השר הנכבד to that of his son Josiah in l. 7, would indicate that they held some official position in the Nagid's cabinet. There probably was some distinction between the epithets of האדיר

and הנכבד, the first possibly given to the one who, besides his diplomatic office, also acted as judge.

1. 12. מבורך, not designated as Nagid. The title צורבא מרבנן is found in another fragment applied to Meborach, father of Moses, the Nagid (Worman, *l. c.*, p. 728, No. XVIII), but this would be no proof of the identity of the two. Since we have to place this Meborach somewhere in the first half of the eleventh century, we cannot identify him with the Meborach who took such a prominent part in the Ebyathar controversy.
1. 14. סעדיהו, son of Meborach, also not mentioned as Nagid. The epithet השר האדיר בישראל would indicate that he was connected with the Nagid's cabinet, as noted above.
1. 16. יהודה, son of Saadia, first one to bear the title of Nagid. It is probable that this Judah is the same in whose honor a poem was composed, first brought to light by Mr. E. N. Adler and published by Neubauer in *JQR.*, VIII, p. 556, since there is hardly any foundation for Neubauer's suggestion (followed by Gottheil, in his article "Egypt", in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, V, p. 68) that that Judah is identical with Judah הנשיא, son of Josiah הנשיא, mentioned in Sambari's Chronicles, p. 133, l. 11. See *JQR.*, VIII, p. 552, and Poznański, in *REJ.*, XLVIII, p. 164 and n. 4.
1. 19. סעדיהו. It is possible that this Saadia is the father of the famous Meborach, son of Saadia, who was Nagid during the latter part of the eleventh century. It is also possible that the name of Meborach is mentioned somewhere in the following lines which are illegible. We know very little about this Saadia, except that he was a physician, as were also some others mentioned in this list. Of his son Meborach, however, we know a great deal, since his name occurs in many fragments, and especially because of the prominent part he took in the controversy described in the *Megillat Ebyathar*. See Schechter, *l. c.*, No. XXXVIII, p. 3, l. 5, and p. 82, n. 8. It may be of interest in this connection to quote from a fragment in Mr. Amram's collection, which reads as follows:

נכך מרנו ורבנו..... מבורך החבר המעולה.....
 אלוף הבינות חכם הישיבה סנהדרא רבא נטרוהי מן.....
 ..ממנא מבי ריש גלותא בן כב גד קד מר ורב סעדיה הח.....
 ומודיעים אנו לכבודכם שאנו חונים שלום אין פר...

צוֹחָה בְּרַחֲמוֹתֵינוּ וְכָל הָעָם הַנִּנְשִׁים אֶל הַמִּשְׁפָּט לִפְנֵינוּ עַל...
בְּשָׁלוֹם וְהוֹדִיָּה לְאֵל עַל כָּל תַּגְמוּלוֹתָי עֲלֵינוּ..... כְּבוֹד....

Comp. Worman, *JQR.*, XVII, p. 13.

מֶשֶׁה, probably son of Meborach, who may have been the Nagid Col. III, l. 1. after his father's death, about the beginning of the twelfth century. See Worman, *l. c.*, XIX, p. 728, No. XVIII, where a Moses, son of Meborach, is mentioned with similar epithets, and where reference is also made to his two sons, whose names, however, are not given. This would strengthen our conjecture that the name of Meborach was given here between the names of Saadia and Moses. The two sons of Moses, whose names are given here as Meborach (l. 4) and Judah (l. 5), both bear the title of הָשֵׁר הָאֲדִיר but not of Nagid.

נֹתָנָאֵל, probably identical with the Nathaniel who was Nagid l. 7. in the time of Maimonides, and probably succeeded by him, after the usurper Zoṭa was ousted. See *Jewish Encyclopedia*, V, p. 68; Neubauer, *l. c.*; Berliner, *Magazin*, 1890, pp. 50-58; comp. Merx, *Documents Paléographiques Hébraïques et Arabes*, p. 39, where mention is made of a נֹתָנָאֵל הָלֵוִי רֹאשׁ יְשִׁיבָה שֶׁל גּוֹלָה, but not Nagid, possibly because of Maimonides, who refused the position when it was offered to him (Neubauer). This may also be the reason why he is not designated as Nagid here. Comp. Poznański, *REJ.*, XLVIII, p. 146, and *Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. Adler, p. 71, n. 1, where Nathaniel is mentioned as the head of the community when Benjamin visited Egypt, but not as Nagid.

יִצְחָק, possibly the same as יִצְחָק הָרִין רֹאשׁ כָּל הַדִּינִים mentioned l. 13. *apud* Schechter, *l. c.*, p. 82, n. 4; also mentioned in another Amram fragment as יִצְחָק בֵּית דִּין הָנוֹן; comp. Worman, *l. c.*, p. 724, No. VII, quoting from a letter addressed by Joseph, son of Solomon, after his father's death, to Jacob, son of Isaac בֵּית דִּין, who may be the same; also *ib.*, No. LXXXII, where יִצְחָק הַכֹּהֵן, son of Jacob, is addressed as הָרִיין הַמִּשְׁכִּיל. The identity of the other Isaac (l. 17) is uncertain.

Line 20 ends the list of the family of הַכִּמִּים. Then another list is given, but the superscription is not legible. I am unable to identify any of the names in the following list with any degree

of certainty. It was rather tempting to identify the last name given here, 'אפרים השר הנכ', with the famous Ephraim b. Shemaryahu, a name that occurs very frequently in the Genizah fragments, so that it was possible for Poznański to construct a biography of him (*REJ.*, XLVIII, p. 145 ff.). If, however, we regard the names in these various lists as contemporaneous, this assumption will have to be rejected, because Ephraim b. Shemaryahu flourished much earlier than the date that might be assigned to the last names mentioned in other lists.

No. II

This is a long, narrow strip of paper, $13\frac{5}{8} \times 3\frac{7}{8}$ inches, written on both sides of the paper, in an old square hand with a strong turn to cursive. One side is filled to the bottom of the page, while the other is not quite half filled. The writing is remarkably well preserved; the paper, however, is perforated in several places.

The names herein mentioned are not as yet known to Jewish history, although the titles attached to most of them would indicate that their bearers were prominent men in the Fostat Jewish community. The name of Nagid, mentioned here at the end, in whose life-time this prayer was recited in the synagogue, is Moses, probably Moses Maimonides, thus fixing the date of the manuscript as the latter half of the twelfth century. The Isaac in line 25 is possibly identical with the one mentioned in the previous list, col. III, l. 13, while Joseph, "the honored prince" of l. 2 may be the same as the one mentioned in the corner of col. IV of the previous list. One Petahiah (l. 18) is mentioned as having died a martyr's death, while two (Joseph, l. 14 and Samuel, l. 26) young men are recorded as having died in a foreign land. The memory of one woman, who is given many pious epithets, is mentioned in ll. 29-31. Her

name is not given, possibly because she was too well known at the time.

The list of the departed concludes with l. 31. Some of the living relatives of the dead are named in ll. 32-47, and consolation is offered them in their bereavement. The last few lines (48-54) conclude with a blessing for the congregation, and especially for the Nagid Moses, and all those who participated in the meritorious act of burying the dead or offering consolation to the living.

אל תרחים:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | דוכרן טב לניחי נפשאתא לזכר המשפחות |
| 2 | המיוחסות עד כִּנְקִי מרְנָה ורב יוסף |
| 3 | השר הנכבד רוח יי' תניחנו . ושני |
| 4 | חמודיו (השרים) הנכבדים נוחם ערן |
| 5 | וכִּנְקִי מרְנָה הם הזקן הנכִּי וחמודו |
| 6 | מר ור יצחק הבחור היקר הנפטר בקוצר |
| 7 | שנים לבית עולמו. ועוד דוכרן טב |
| 8 | לזכר כִּנְקִי מר ור שלמה הזקן הנכִּי נִבְעֵי |
| 9 | וחמודו כִּנְקִי מר ור יוסף הזקן הנכִּי |
| 10 | נִבְעֵי . ושני חמודיו כִּנְקִי מר ור סעדיה |
| 11 | הזקן הנכִּי נִבְעֵי . וכבִּי גִדִּי קִדִּי מרנו ורבנו |
| 12 | שמואל החסיד בעודו רוח יי' תניחנו. |
| 13 | ושני חמודיו מר ור יוסף הבחור היקר |
| 14 | הנפטר בארץ אכסניותו נִבְעֵי וכִּנְקִי |
| 15 | מר ור סעדיה הבחור היקר נִבְעֵי |
| 16 | ועוד דוכרן טב לזכר כִּנְקִי מר ור |
| 17 | פריחיה הזקן הנכִּי הנחרג על ייחוד השם |
| 18 | נִבְעֵי . וכִּנְקִי מר ור יוסף הזקן ביר |

- 19 עמרם הזקן נוחם ערן . ועוד דוכרן
 20 טב לניחי נפשאתא לזכר כִּנְקִי מרנו
 21 ורבנו שמואל השר הנכ רוח יי' תניח
 22 ושני חמודיו כִּנְקִי מר ור יוסף
 23 הזקן הנכ נִבְעֵ . וכִּנְקִי מרנו ורבנו
 24 יצחק בית דין הגון זכרו לבר.
 25 וחמודו מר ור שמואל הבחור הנפטר
 26 בארץ אכסניותו, וכִּנְקִי מרנו ורבנו
 27 יעקוב החכם והנבון נִבְעֵ:
 28 והגבירה היקרה הישרה הצנועה
 29 החסידה הנפטרת בשם טוב ובמעשים
 30 טובים לבית עולמה ונפטרינו ונפטרי
 31 עם יי' רוח יי' תניחם וכול.
 32 והחיים והשלום והכבוד וכללי הנחמ
 33 הכתובות והרשומות. כולם יחולו
 34 על ראש כבוד גד קד יצחק הרב
 35 (וכל) ושני חמודיו כִּנְקִי מר ור שמואל
 36 החכם והנבון ואחיו מר ור (יוסף).....
 37האלהים ינחמם מאבלם
 38 וכול וגם ינחם אלהינו את לב כב גד

VERSO

- 39 קד מרנו ורבנו יעקוב החכם
 וכלל חמודיו
 40 והנבון באתריה האלהים ינחמהו
 41 באבלו וכול גם ינחם (אלהינו את) לב
 42 כל הענומים באבל הזה בראשם
 43 כִּנְקִי מר ורב יוסף החכם והנבון

- 44 וְכִנָּק מִן וְרַב שְׁמוּאֵל הִיקָר וְהַנְבוֹן
- 45 וְחִמּוּדִיו וְכֻלָּל הַמַּתְעַרְבִים עִמָּם
- 46 בְּאֵבֶל הַזֶּה הָאֱלֹהִים יִנְחָמָם מֵאֵבֶלָם
- 47 וְכֻלָּ וְיִבְרַךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת כֻּלָּל הַקָּהָל
- 48 הַקְּדוֹשׁ הַזֶּה מִגְדוּלָם וְעַד קִטְנָם
- 49 וּבְרָאשֵׁם כְּבוֹד גְּדֻלַּת קְדֻשָּׁת
- 50 מִרְנּוֹ וּרְבִנּוֹ אֲדוֹנֵנוּ נִגִּידֵנוּ מֹשֶׁה
- 51 הַנִּגִּיד הַגְּדוֹל וְכֻלָּ . וְכֻלָּל הַקָּהָל
- 52 הַקְּדוֹשׁ הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר בָּאוּ וְגִמְלוּ חֶסֶד
- 53 שׁוֹמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד וְכֻלָּ

STUDIES IN GAONIC HISTORY AND LITERATURE

BY ALEXANDER MARX,

Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

THE last decades of the Gaonic age have hitherto been among the most obscure periods of Jewish history; and yet those years were of the highest importance, determining the subsequent development and marking a turning-point in the spiritual life of Jewry. For up to that time, Palestine and Babylonia had indisputably constituted the centers of Jewish culture. About the beginning of the eleventh century or the end of the tenth, there ensued a period of decentralization, and the influence of Babylonia waned more and more, although just then the administration of the academies and thus also the direction of the entire spiritual life were in the hands of particularly eminent persons. While the supremacy of the Babylonian schools was accepted without reserve by the new centers of culture just then arising in the Occident, nevertheless their rivalry was necessarily detrimental to the continued existence of the older seats of learning, whose very source of income was being diverted. Much light has been shed upon these circumstances by the finds of recent years. Our knowledge of the conditions prevailing in Babylonia and Palestine, in Italy and in the various parts of Northern Africa, has been materially increased through the publication of the *Chronicles of Ahimaaz* and of the numerous more or

less complete texts belonging to the Genizah. These discoveries, while extending our knowledge and rectifying erroneous and legendary conceptions, have also opened up new problems, and have naturally prompted a large number of scholars to occupy themselves with this period. Of no field of inquiry is the motto *Dies diem docet* truer, as new material from the inexhaustible hoard of the Genizah is constantly becoming accessible, serving, as the case may be, to confirm, to correct, or to overthrow earlier conjectures. In the following Studies, coming as they do in the wake of the meritorious efforts of Schechter, Harkavy, Epstein, Ginzberg, Poznański, Eppenstein and others, the writer purposes a re-examination of a number of historical and literary questions, in the course of which several new texts are to be published for the first time.

I. THE PALESTINIAN ACADEMIES

The unexpected discoveries of the Genizah have proved helpful to a greater extent than in any other field of investigation in lifting the veil from the spiritual activity of Palestinian Jewry during the second half of the first millennium, at any rate so far as the last century of that period is concerned. Here more than one chapter has been won back for Jewish history. Our conceptions of important points, as above all of the settlement of the calendar, have undergone a thorough revision. Passages with which we were long familiar are now assuming on the basis of our extended knowledge a totally different aspect, in their way enabling us to complete the newly-won picture. It is my aim to discuss a number of such passages which have hitherto been the subject of scant or inadequate attention.

It may be doubted whether the Palestinian academies at any time officially renounced the prerogative of fixing the calendar; it rather appears that there was a constant clash of opinions between Palestine and Babylonia. So long as no substantial difference in the calculation itself was manifested, the opposition expressed itself in fruitless protests on the part of the weaker side, but otherwise left no distinct traces.¹ Matters came to a head only when Ben Meir advanced such rules of forming the calendar as involved a practical difference in the fixing of the festivals. Then, of course, a decisive combat was inevitable, in which, however, Palestine was worsted. If the Babylonians maintained² that from immemorial times they had not been influenced in their calendar calculations by Palestine, it stands to reason that even in earlier times the other side was not minded to acquiesce in this state of affairs. We rather find distinct

¹ It sounds like a theoretical recognition of the supremacy of Palestine when in the prayer *יקום פרקן*, which is undoubtedly of Babylonian origin, the *scholars of Palestine* are named first. The reference, however, is wanting in the *Turin Siddur*, a transcript of which was made available to me through the kindness of Prof. Schechter (comp. my *Untersuchungen zum Siddur des Gaon R. Amram*, I, Berlin 1908, 23 f.). There we read: *לכל קהליא קדישא די בארעא דישראל: ודי בארעא דבבל ודי בכל ארע גלותהון לרישי כלה ולרבני חבורתא ולרישי מתיבתא ולדייני דבבא ולכל תלמידהון*. Equally noteworthy is the omission of all reference to the exilarchs, who in our Book of Prayer are peculiarly enough introduced amidst the officials of the Academy. Such reference is also wanting in the *מחזור ויטרי*, p. 172 f., and in a Siddur according to the ritual of Ancient France (previously cod. Halberstam 443: comp. *ZfhB.*, IX, 143) in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, both agreeing substantially with regard to this case: *למרנן ורבנן (לכל מרנא) חבורתא קדישתא (הדין) די בארעא דישראל ודי בבבל רישי כלי ורישי מתיבתא דייני דבבא ודייני דמתא...* The latter are mentioned nowhere else.

² Schechter, *Saadyana*, Cambridge 1903, 17; Bornstein in *ספר היוכל* in honor of Sokolow, Warsaw 1904, 89.

traces of a polemical attitude to Babylonian emancipation from Palestinian dominion, not only in the *Megillat Ebiathar*³ of a later date, but also at an earlier period antecedent to Ben Meir. In the *Pirke derabbi Eliezer*, chapter viii, we read: "When no one was left in Palestine, the intercalation was ordained in Babylonia. Nevertheless, when Ezra and the entire congregation returned, Ezekiel set about ordaining an intercalation on Babylonian soil. But the Holy One, blessed be He, said to him: Ezekiel, thou hast no right to perform this act outside of Palestine; thy brethren are now in their own country; let them attend to that matter."⁴ This sounds like an emphatic protest against the Babylonian practice, especially when we remember that, according to an explicit statement in the Palestinian Talmud,⁵ Ezekiel ordained the intercalation on Babylonian soil. It is likely that the passage alluded to was quoted by Ben Meir in the portion of his letter now missing.⁶ The statements found

³ Schechter, *l. c.*, 86-104. I quote according to the pages and lines of the MS. as there indicated.

⁴ לא נשאר אחד בארץ היו מעברין את השנה בבבל עלה עזרא וכל הקהל עמו ורצה יחזקאל לעבר את השנה בחוצה לארץ אמר לו הקב"ה יחזקאל אין לך רשות לעבר את השנה בחוצה לארץ הרי ישראל אחיכם בארצם והם יעברו. Prof. Schechter has been kind enough to call my attention to the present passage as well as to several others. He has also drawn my attention to the formula of the announcement of the new moon in the Italian ritual, which perhaps owes its origin to old disputes. It reads as follows: כך גזרו רבותינו המכובדים שנברין בפני הקהל הקדוש הזה שיהיו יודעים גדולים רבותינו שיש לנו ראש חדש... כחשבון רבותינו... The formula, almost verbatim, is found in the Avignon ritual (II סדר תמיד, Avignon 1767, f. 46 a). In the Kaffa ritual the announcement reads: הקול כל עמא הבו דעתכון למשמע קל קדושא דירחא הדין כמה דגזרו מרנן ורבנן חבורא דעתיכון למשמע קל קדושא דהו יתבין בארעא דישראל... (Siddur, ed. Mezyrow, 1793). In the Corfu ritual (MS.), the Passover is announced on the שבת הגדול with a rather lengthy formula, which begins as follows: כך גזרו רבותינו סנהדרין גאונים עולם בבית מקדש שני...

⁵ יחזקאל עובר בחוצה לארץ. p. Sanh. I. 2, f. 19 a, l. 6.

⁶ Epstein, *REL.*, XLI, 182 below; Bornstein, *l. c.*, 64 f.

in the same chapter concerning the procedure at the announcement of the new moon⁷ under the presidency of the ראש ישיבה and especially the use of this title point clearly to the post-Talmudic academies of Palestine.⁸

The same is true of the Targum on Canticles⁹ (7, 3 and 5; cf. also 8, 13), where the importance of the head of the (Palestinian) Academy is painted in glowing colors. The text, as found in a Yemen MS. belonging to the Seminary Library,¹⁰ which I have collated with that of

⁷ Ebiathar, p. 7, l. 25 ff., quotes the passage as an old source.

⁸ Comp. also Tobiah b. Eliezer, שלא תהא לך on Exod. 12, 2: שנה מתעברת אלא עפ"י בית דין כך עושין בארץ ישראל לפני ראש הישיבה. It is true that the conclusion is wanting in the Florentine MS. (comp. Buber *ad locum*), whereas a MS. belonging to the New York Seminary reads לפני הישיבה!

Zunz, *GV.*², 289 (comp. remark a) places the composition of the *Pirke derabbi Eliezer* about the year 700. His reasons find further support in the fact that our book is quoted in the middle of the ninth century in *Babylonia* as an authority in halakic matters; comp. the responsum of Natronai in the *Siddur R. Amram*, f. 32 a, and חמדה גנוזה, No. 93; also my *Untersuchungen*, etc., 8 f., note 31, where it should be added that Weiss, *בית תלמוד*, I, 116, note, has called attention to this passage, which also escaped the memory of Bornstein, *l. c.*, 178. The Ben Meir quotation there mentioned is accordingly not the oldest. Schorr (החלוץ, V, 38) calls attention to the fact that the *Pirke derabbi Eliezer* are adduced in the version of the *Halakot gedolot* used by Zidkiah b. Abraham (שבלי הלקט השלם), ed. Buber, 376, § 6).

The attitude of the *Pirke derabbi Eliezer* to the question of the calendar is designated by Zunz as one of the reasons for placing its composition in Palestine. Comp. also Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 208, additions to p. 93, and in addition also *Kirkisani*, ed. Harkavy, 295.

⁹ As to the late date of this Targum, Landauer, *Orientalische Studien*, 505, convincingly points to its use of Arabic words.

¹⁰ 31, f. 8^o (one leaf in the middle and one at the end are missing). The MS., which dates from the sixteenth century, contains the Hebrew text together with the Targum in Babylonian punctuation, also a literal Arabic translation. An unpointed MS. of the year 1732 with an Arabic translation of the Targum and a MS. of Canticles, Ruth and Koheleth with commentaries and a Targum in the common punctuation (by the hand of a Yemenite) offer no essential variants. A fourth Yemenite MS. contains only the text and Targum of chap. 1-2, 1 and 7, 9-8, 7. An Italian MS. of the fifteenth

וריש מתיבתך דבוכותיה: the current editions, reads as follows: מתפרנסין כל עמא (עלמא) היא כמא דעברא מתפרנים מן פרתיה במעיא (במעונא) דאמיה בהיק באוריתא כאוגנא דסיהרא במיתיה לדכאה ולסאבה לזכאה ולחייבא ולא חסרין פתגמי אוריתא תדירא מפומיה היא כמא דלא חסרין (פסקין) מוי דנהרא רבא דנפיק מעדן. ושבעין חכימין מסחרין יתיה כאידר סגלגל ואוצריהון מליין מן מעסר קדישא ונדריא ונדבתא דסייגו להון עזרא כהנא וזרבבל וישוע ונחמיה ומרדכי בלשן אנשי (רבני) כנשתא רבתא דמתילין לורדין בנין דיהי להון חילא למעסק באוריתא יומם ולילי:

ואב בית דינא דדאין דיניך חסין על עמא (עלמא) לכפתא יתהון ולמנגד מן דאתחייב בדינא לנגדא כשלמה מלכא דעבר מגדלא דשן דפיל וכבש ית עמא בית ישראל ואהדר יתהון למרי עלמא: ספריך מלן חכמתא כפרקטנין וידעין (לממני) חושבני עבורי ומעברין שנין וקובעין רישי (שנין ורישי) ירחין בתרע בית סנהדרין רבא ורב בית בא לבית יהודה דמי לדור מלכא דבנא מצדתא דציון דמתקרי מגדלא דלבנן דכל מן דיקום עלוהי יכיל לממני כל מגדלין דבדמסק:

The Scriptural phrase (Cant. 7, 3) בחשבון על שער בת רבים offers an occasion for bringing the fixing of the calendar in connection with the synedrion, by which name the academies were designated in post-Talmudic times as, for instance, Ben Meir repeatedly calls those in Palestine. Interesting are the statements concerning the judicial activity of the *Ab bet din*¹¹ who was known as the *Dayyana di-Baba*¹²

century on parchment which contains the Targum of Ruth, Canticles and Koheleth (without the text; at the beginning and at the end it is defective) agrees on the whole with the editions.

¹¹ Comp. Tanhuma, *init.*: יושב יתיב אלא שהוא יושב: thus Moses Tachau, III, 71; this reading is to be preferred to that of the editions as well as to that of the Buber ed.

¹² Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, II, 35, n. 41. Comp. also Eppenstein, *MGHJ*, I, III (1908), 337 f. בית דין הגדול or בית דינא רבה in conjunction with שער הישיבה or באבא דמתיבתא occurs in addition in Harkavy, p. 90.

in Babylonia. As to the sources of the revenue of the academies, nowhere else do we learn that they received tithes.

From other sources we learn that the cost of maintenance of the academies was derived principally from the freewill-offerings of the pilgrims to Jerusalem. The most ancient example is probably afforded by the reference in the Chronicle of Ahimaaz,¹³ thus carrying us back some seventy years before the time of Ben Meir. According to the Chronicle just mentioned, a certain Ahimaaz contributed, whenever he made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, (three times in all), 100 זהובים to the maintenance of the academy of the holy city. The phrase לעוסקי בתורתו can have reference only to the academy, especially as Ahimaaz is afterwards entertained at table by the ראש ישיבה. We may conjecture that he took part in the procession about the Mount of Olives¹⁴ on הושענא רבא. There is no reason whatsoever to doubt the historical character of the incident.

No. 200; p. 149, No. 315; p. 156, No. 329; in *JQR.*, VI, 223 (in the two latter places בית דין הגדול דכל ישראל); in the responsum mentioned below (note 25); and in still earlier times, Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 214.—Another reference bearing on the judicial function of the Academies is *Ittur*, I, 45 a below: וכל דיוני דמתיבתא ואבות ב"ד הראשונים כך היו דנים. *Ib.*, 18d, mention is made of a case brought before the Academy: פלוני תבעיה: לשמעון [לדינא] לבבא דמתיבתא.

¹³ Neubauer, *Chronicles*, II, 113.—The gifts of Paltiel (*ib.*, 128) and his son Samuel (p. 130) have been pointed out by Poznański, *REJ.*, XLVIII, 146, n. 1. In the latter instance the ראש ישיבה is not mentioned; on the other hand the תנאים are referred to, who are thus proved to have existed also in the Palestinian academies of the gaonic period.

¹⁴ To the authorities adduced by Poznański, *REJ.*, XLVIII, 153, n. 2, add the Arab writer Albiruni (about the year 1000) who in his *Chronology of Ancient Nations* (translated by Sachau, London 1879, 270; comp. p. 431) makes mention of these processions.

In the second half of the ninth century, when the Sura Academy had been closed for some time, the Palestinian Academy is repeatedly¹⁵ mentioned instead of it side by side with that of Pumbeditha.

The passages just discussed are interesting for the reason that they relate to the period elapsing between the time of the heads of the academies mentioned at the conclusion of *Seder Olam Zuta* and the time of Ben Meir. They show that in all probability up to the time of the advent of the Crusaders in 1096 the Palestinian academies flourished uninterrupted; ¹⁶ further proof, it may be hoped, will be forthcoming, when more finds become available.

In connection with this, it may be proper to discuss several further points bearing on the Palestinian Academies. It is still a matter of doubt with me whether Mar Zutra, as is universally maintained, on his arrival in Palestine in 520¹⁷, really occupied the position of ראש ישיבה. Eppenstein¹⁸ has recently pointed out with justice that the phrase ונעשה ראש ועיילוה בריש פרקיה סנהדרין is not the Hebrew equivalent of ראש ישיבה. The plural ἀρχιφερεκίται in the well-known decree of Justinian

¹⁵ Comp. the reply of the *King of the Khazars* to Hasdai ibn Shaprut, towards the end, Pardes, ed. Const., f. 41 d, ed. Warsaw, § 166, and Yefet ben Ali on Zech. 5, 9 in Poznański, *The Karaitic Literary Opponents of Saadiah Gaon*, London 1909, 38, n. 1; also Jacob ben Ruben in ספר העושר on the same passage (ed. Gozlov, f. 20 d) and Hadassi, אשכול הכופר, f. 46 a, l. 1-4. The latter two references, which long ago were pointed out by Zunz, *Ritus*, 158, are to be added to those cited by Poznański.

¹⁶ From the book וזהויר (I, 101-2), which originated in Palestine, the impression is obtained that the author knew of no ראש ישיבה in Palestine; the whole passage, however, is far from being clear. A Palestinian exilarch (ראש גולה שבארץ ישראל) is mentioned there. Is that to be understood as a designation of the earlier Patriarchs?

¹⁷ The variant 522 in the chronicle incorporated by Jerahmeel in his compilation (Neubauer, *l. c.*, I, 178) has no foundation whatsoever, the parallel text in cod. Epstein published by me in *ZfHB.*, V, 57 and Cod. De Rossi 1409 agreeing with the *Seder Olam Zuta*.

¹⁸ *MGHJ.*, I.II (1908), 464, n. 1.

prohibiting the recitation of the *δευτέρωσις* (no matter what may be meant by the latter term¹⁹) proves that at one and the same time more than one man bore this title. Hence, Mar Zutra, at the time of his arrival in Palestine, became one of the archipherekites, while another may have been ראש ישיבה. Since, in later times, his descendants occupied this position, as we know beyond a doubt in the case of R. Phinehas, it is quite possible that a later glossator, perhaps the one who in 804 carried forward the *Seder Olam Zuta* for two generations, conjecturally reconstructing history, claimed the same dignity for Mar Zutra himself. He thus amplified the original Aramaic report by the Hebrew gloss: עלה לארץ ישראל ונעשה ראש סנהדרין. If this be the case, we must remain for the present in a state of ignorance as to when the Davidides of male descent assumed the headship of the Palestinian Academies and how long they maintained themselves in this position. It is a matter of certainty only in the case of R. Phinehas,²⁰ according to Brüll's²¹ conjecture, which has been universally accepted.²²

At the beginning of the tenth century, the head of the Palestinian School was Ben Meir, a descendant of the earlier Patriarchs, who traced their genealogy to

¹⁹ Eppenstein, *l. c.*, 465, n. 1, has collected the various opinions concerning this term; the opinion of Graetz, however, is reproduced inexactlly, "haggadic exposition" being substituted in the place of "haggadic and halakic Midrash". Add also Vogelstein-Rieger, *Juden in Rom*, I, 173.

²⁰ One might conjecture that the title רבי in the case of Phinehas whose predecessors are designated as רב (comp. Zunz, *l. c.*, 144, n. a) has something to do with our question, but for the fact that his brothers are likewise called רבי.

²¹ *Jahrbücher*, V-VI, 96.

²² In subsequent times we find, according to the *Megillah* of Ebiathar, another Davidide of male descent, Daniel b. Azariah, temporarily at the head of the Academy. He may possibly have been a descendant of Mar Zutra and on that ground claimed the position at the time of his supplanting the incumbent.

David only along the line of female descent. Somewhat later we find descendants of Aaron in this leading position. Some light is shed on the century between Ben Meir and Solomon b. Judah, the oldest hitherto known **ראש ישיבה** of Aaronitic descent, by a genealogical list in Cod. Oxford 2443 to which Poznański has recently²³ drawn attention. That part of it, with which we are concerned, reads as follows: **צדוק אב בית דין ביר' יאשיה הרב** **ביר' אהרן ראש הישיבה ביר' יאשיהו אב בית דין ביר' אברהם ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב נכד הגאונים נין רבינו הקדוש**. Poznański regards it as possible that Abraham was the son of Ben Meir. That, however, is exceedingly improbable, since the time between Ben Meir (922) and Zadok (1084—*ca.* 1109) is somewhat too long for the four intervening generations, and it were strange if the genealogy ended just at the famous ancestor. Nevertheless, it is to be assumed that, at all events, Abraham was a descendant of Ben Meir. If, as it is probable, the title **ראש הישיבה** is identical with **ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב**, we are confronted with two new heads of the Palestinian Academy. Between the two, it is likely that a member of another family was in office. With all due reserve, I would advance the conjecture that a notice found by Harkavy at the end of an old Midrash MS. and published by him more than thirty years ago,²⁴ though naturally its explanation was impossible at that time, belongs in this connection: **כב' גד' קדש' מרינו ורבינו** **יוסף הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב המכובד ומרי' יאשיהו אב בית דין ומרי' יצחק אחיו השלישי ומרי' שמואל בן עזרון נ"נ**. The

²³ *REJ.*, LVII, 265-67.

²⁴ *המגיד*, XXI (1877), 134.

title **ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב**²⁵ speaks in favor of Palestine, and it is highly probable that **יאשיהו** is identical with one of the two mentioned in the genealogical list given above. The younger of the two, the one who is there named **הרב**, while in the *Mcgillat Ebiathar*²⁶ he is expressly designated as **[ב"ד] אב**, probably was in office in the beginning of the career of Solomon b. Judah, whose son Joseph apparently became

²⁵ Babylonia is out of the question, since we know the names of the Geonim there. The title **ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב** is borne in the Orient at the time we are considering only by the heads of the Babylonian and Palestinian Academies.

Poznański (*REJ.*, LI, 55-58) remarks that the Geonim never designate themselves as **ראש ישיבה של גולה**, while they may have been so styled by others, and Ginzberg (*Geonica*, I, 148) conjectures that that was the original title of the Geonim of Pumbaditha (**גולה** = Pumbaditha), who only after the cessation of the Sura Academy called themselves after the fashion of the heads of the latter **ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב**. This would explain the interchange of superscriptions, as in the Responsa, ed. Harkavy, p. 88, No. 198 (cited by Poznański); *ib.*, p. 90, No. 200; or in an Arabic responsum, which Dr. I. Friedlaender contemplates editing shortly, where we read: **נשאלה כולפנינו כושער הישיבה של גולה מבית דין הגדול של אדונינו שרירא ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב חמוד אדונינו חנניה ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב**. The Academy naturally retained its ancient name, and people continued to speak of the **שער הישיבה של גולה**. Nevertheless, in Harkavy, p. 215, Hai, in the superscription to No. 419 ff., calls himself and his ancestors **ראש ישיבה של גולה**, which, to say the least, renders Poznański's thesis somewhat doubtful. The reading in Amram's Siddur, which Ginzberg contests, is supported by the evidence of the MSS. as well as such early quotations as Mahzor Vitry, § 46, **תורתן של ראשונים**, II 23, and **ליקוטי פרדס**: I fail to see how the omission in a short summary of the responsum in **אשכול** I 33, to which Tur **א"ח** 132, and Mannig, 20 b, might be added, could prove anything against the authenticity of the words in question.

Zunz, *GV*², 178, remarks that the title **ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב** occurs in the **א"ב דר' עקיבא** and the **אותות המשיח**. The Karaites, likewise, have taken over this title (Zanz, *Ritus*, 158); similarly **ראש כלה** occurs with them. Poznański is mistaken in asserting (**אנשי קירואן**, 25, n. 1) on the basis of the *Chronicles of Ahimaaz* the prevalence of the title **ראש ישיבה** in Southern Italy. In the passage in question a Palestinian **ראש ישיבה** is referred to! **ראש ישיבה של גולה** occurs in *Sefer Hasidim*, ed. Berlin, p. 15.

²⁶ p. 2, l. 18.

his successor. His son Zadok became, in 1084, שלישי, having up to that time been רביעי. The dates show that he was the son of his old age. It was probably his father who occupied the position of ראש אב"ד under Solomon b. Judah, whom we find as early as 1030, hence about fifty-five years before, at the head of the academy. On the other hand, it is extremely improbable that he was in office under Solomon's predecessor, since in Palestine the ראש אב"ד, as a rule, appears to have become the successor of the Gaon. It therefore seems that the older Josiah must have been meant in the notice mentioned above. We should then obtain the following list of heads of the Palestinian Academies:

ראש ישיבה

אב ב"ד

Ben Meir

— — —
— — —

Abraham

*Joseph ha-Kohen I*²⁷

Aaron b. Josiah I

Solomon b. Judah (*ca.* 1030)

Joseph ha-Kohen III

b. Solomon (up to 1054)

Daniel b. Azariah²⁸ (1054-62)

Elijah b. Solomon (1062-84)

Ebiathar b. Elijah (1084-96)

Josiah I b. Abraham

Joseph ha-Kohen II²⁸

Josiah II b. Aaron

Elijah b. Solomon

Elijah b. Solomon

Ebiathar b. Elijah

Solomon b. Elijah, later

Zadok b. Josiah II³⁰.

²⁷ The one mentioned in the notice referred to above.—According to Epstein, *MGWJ.*, XLVII (1903), 343, the Ebiathar mentioned in the *Sefer Hasidim* should be inserted here.

²⁸ *Saadyana*, 81; *REJ.*, LI, 53; probably the grandfather of Solomon b. Judah, possibly a nephew of Joseph ha-Kohen I.

²⁹ Comp. above, note 22.

³⁰ Comp. *Megillat Ebiathar*, p. 2, l. 18 and *ZfhB.*, X, 145; *MGWJ.*, LII (1908), 110, as well as the genealogical list mentioned above.

The circumstance that Joseph (I.) is not mentioned in the list published by Poznański³¹ is easily explained, since he was not a direct ancestor of Mazliah b. Elijah, as all the heads of the academy enumerated in the lists were. For the same reason³² neither Elijah's predecessor, his brother Joseph (III.), nor his second son Solomon is mentioned.

To be sure, it is also possible that in the notice the Joseph (III.) mentioned in the *Megillat Ebiathar* is alluded to and that Josiah was Elijah's predecessor in his capacity of אב"ד. This supposition, however, it seems to me, is precluded by the fact that, judging from the analogy of the other cases, Josiah should have become the successor of Solomon if as the son of Solomon's predecessor he had held the office of אב"ד under him. If he had been dead by that time, the office should have reverted to his brother Isaac the שלישי in our note, of whom, it is true, we know nothing further. It may, therefore, be laid down as probable that reference is made to an entirely different Joseph (I.).

If this conjecture be true, we find that for several generations the families of Davidic and Aaronitic descent successively occupied the leading office; the pre-eminent rôle assigned to Zadok in the report of Ebiathar and the warmth with which he places himself on the side of the Aaronides preclude the supposition that the Davidides had been forcibly set aside. In that case the position of שלישי was not created by Solomon, but had been in existence long before.

Nor is the son of the repeatedly mentioned Zadok unknown to us. His name according to the genealogical

³¹ *REJ.*, LI, 53.

³² Not because he played no important role, as Poznański, p. 54, thinks.

list alluded to above was Hillel. In 1155-6 he appears in Alexandria (?) as signatory to two documents in a collection described by Harkavy³³; similarly in 1164 in Fostat to a כתובה דאירכסה published in facsimile by Merx.³⁴ We see now that D. Kaufmann³⁵ was wrong in declaring Merx's reading הלל בירבי צדוק אב"ד impossible, on the supposition that an אב"ד would not sign last. A son of this Hillel³⁶ was, as has been remarked by Poznański, the author of the *Megillah Zuta*; a סליחה by him is preserved in cod. Oxford 2852³⁷; he also appears as a witness in 1218 in cod. 2876¹.

I may be permitted to discuss at this juncture a date of the *Megillat Ebiathar*³⁷ which we are in a position to verify from another source. We read (p. 2, l. 27 of the text) that David ben Daniel emigrated from Babylonia three years before the death of the Gaon Elijah, which is placed (*ib.*, l. 23) in the year 1395 Sel.=1084, and that two years after his emigration (p. 3, l. 3), hence in 1394=1083, he came to Egypt. On the other hand, we gather from his כתובה³⁸ that he was in Egypt in 1393 Sel.=1082, when he married a second time. I propose as the simplest solution of the difficulty thus presented that we read in Ebiathar's *Megillah*

³³ מאסף נדחים, No. 12, St. Petersburg 1879-1881, 183. The names found there point rather to Fostat than to Alexandria.

³⁴ *Documents de Paléographie Hébraïque*, Leyden 1894, 41.—In the document cod. Oxford 2878⁷⁶, where we find him as a signatory, the date is wanting.

³⁵ *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 28.

³⁶ Another son seems to have been מאיר ביר הלל ביר צדוק אב"ד זצ"ל, a signatory of cod. Oxford 2878⁷⁸ in 1161. A brother of Hillel, Moses, signed cod. Oxford 2878², in 1137. Josiah b. Moses, probably his son, occurs together with Abraham b. Hillel, as signatory in "Jews' College Jubilee Volume", p. 108.

³⁷ See above, note 3.

³⁸ Ed. Schechter, *JQR.*, XIII, 221 f. Poznański (*REJ.*, XLVIII, 164, n. 1) goes astray in saying that the *Ketubah* is dated 1084 (=1395 Sel.).

שש in the place of שלש. Then David came to Palestine in 1389 = 1078 and to Egypt in 1391 = 1080, where after two years he married a Karaite lady. Thus disappears one of the difficulties which induced Bacher³⁹ to dispute Schechter's conjecture⁴⁰ that David was a son of Daniel b. Azariah. For, according to the correction proposed above, there intervene only about sixteen years between the death of the latter (Elul 1373 Sel. = 1062) and the emigration of his son David from Babylonia at the age of twenty years. Poznański⁴¹ rejected Bacher's grounds as unsatisfactory, and subsequently⁴² adduced as a positive proof for Schechter's supposition the fact that Daniel, the father of David, is designated in the *Ketubah* as ראש ישיבה. It remains to be added that he is named elsewhere⁴³ נשיא גאון כל ישראל.

Lastly I may be permitted to give expression with all due reserve to a conjecture concerning the letter of the אנשי רינוס to the Palestinian Communities of the year 960⁴⁴. In this letter, the Jews of the Rhenish country among other things inquire concerning the advent of the Messiah and receive a sharp reply in the negative. Perhaps they had before them a text of the *Sefer Zerubbabel* such as is at present wedged in between chap. xxxii, § 4 and chap. xl, § 2 of the *Pirke Hekhalot*, ed. Wertheimer.⁴⁵ There the advent

³⁹ *JQR.*, XV, 86, n. 6.

⁴⁰ *Saadyana*, 81.

⁴¹ *Schechter's Saadyana*, Frkf. a. M. 1904, 10, n. 3.

⁴² *REJ.*, l. c., 166, n. 1.

⁴³ *Saadyana*, 81, n. 2. According to Worman, *JQR.*, XVIII, 14, n. 10, he appears also in two other documents as head of the Academy. The name of David is found also in a document, cod. Or. 5545 of the British Museum, dated 1089, the beginning of which has been reproduced by Margoliouth, *JE.*, VIII, 309, as the 36th specimen of writing. We read there: מצרים דעל גילום ... נהרא מותבה. שלמרנו אדוננו נשיאנו דויד comp. *JQR.*, XVIII, 14, n. 11.

⁴⁴ Comp. on this matter the exhaustive paper by Büchler in *REJ.*, XLIV, 237 ff.

⁴⁵ Jerusalem 1890.

of the Messiah is announced for the year 890⁴⁶ after the destruction of the Temple (= 958), which is two years before the date of the letter just mentioned. It is true that in all other texts⁴⁷ we find 990; nevertheless, a subsequent alteration of a number of this character would be nothing extraordinary. Zunz⁴⁸ has even assumed in our case an older date than 990 as the original. The *Book of Zerubbabel*, according to Graetz,⁴⁹ was composed in Italy and may therefore have been unknown in Jerusalem. On the other hand, we have, at least for later periods, unmistakable evidence that it was current in the Rhenish provinces. Eleazar of Worms⁵⁰ quotes our apocalypse as *Baraita di Zerubbabel*, and Jacob b. Shimshon⁵¹, who flourished in the first quarter of the twelfth century and resided for a time at Worms, as *Sefer Zerubbabel*⁵². In the first half of the fourteenth century, Asher b. Jacob ha-Levi incorporated this piece of literature in his collection ספר הזכרונות.⁵³ The compiler of codex 326 of the Paris Library⁵⁴, who lived in the Rhenish country between 1160 and 1180, incorporated in his compilation

⁴⁶ Judah ha-Levi predicts the fall of the Mohammedan empire for the same year (890) of the fifth millennium; comp. *Divan*, ed. Brody, II, 302.

⁴⁷ Jellinek, לקט המדרשים II, 55 and 56; Wertheimer, לקט המדרשים, Jerus. 1903, 11 b.

⁴⁸ *Literaturgeschichte*, 603.

⁴⁹ *Geschichte*, VI³, 53 f. Comp. Harkavy, חדשים גם ישנים, No. 7, p. 16.

⁵⁰ יין הרקח on Ruth 4, 11.

⁵¹ Concerning him see Epstein, *REJ.*, XXXV, 241-246.

⁵² Reprint from Mahzor Vitry, Erkrft. a. M. 1897, 3 below. The quotation is found only in one MS.

⁵³ Cod. Oxford 2797³.

⁵⁴ According to Neubauer, *MGWJ.*, XXXVI (1887), 502 f., Jacob b. Abraham; comp. on the other hand Chwolson in קובץ על יד, VII (1896-7), 3-4. In the appendix to the Catalogue of his Library (1903), p. 156, No. 8, Chwolson names Jacob b. Asher ha-Levi (ca. 1220) as the compiler. No doubt, however, exists as to the home of the compiler!

(fol. 109 a) the following passage which I copied several years ago: **ולקץ הימים תבא חפצי בה אם מנחם בן עמיאל אשת נתן הנביא ותביא עמו נפשות רבות מישראל והוא עושה מלחמה עם נוף מלך תימן ואסרט מלך אנטוכיא וניצחתן . ואחר כך יבא נחמיה בן חושיאל הוא משיח בן אפרים ומלכי האומות מתאספין ונלחמו עמם וניצחתן אותו ונהרג הוא ונפשות רבות מישראל והנשוארים בורחים להם ועומדים בצרה גדולה מהן בורחין בין האומות ומהן בורחין דרך (ה) מדבר העמים שבאו דרך שם מתחילה והם אוכלים שרשים מלוחים מ"ה ימים . ויתר הפליטה הנשארת לישראל מתוך צרה גדולה שהם עומדים בה הם עושים תשובה שלימה לפני הקב"ה ממרת נפשם וחמת רוחם ומגלה להם את משיח בן דוד . עד יעיר הקב"ה ברוחו את מנחם בן עמיאל הוא משיח בן דוד ומחיי' להם מתים והם חוזרים להם לישראל וגוג שומע שחזרו ישראל למקומם ועולה עליהם . והקב"ה יורד על הר הזיתים ונלחם בהם ומקנא בצרתן של ישראל ועל ידי תפילתו של משיח ונלחם עם ארמילוס ומת בידו והוא שנ' ברוח שפתיו ימית רשע הוא גוג והמון כל הגוים הצובאים על ירושלים . וארמילוס זה שאמרנו בנו של שטן הוא שיש אבן בננווה דמות אשה יפה שאין כתארה בעולם . היא ננווה היא רומי הגדולה ובא עליה השטן וילד ממנו ארמילוס . ואותה מלחמה לקץ מ"ה שנה לבריאתה של חפצי בה שבאתה לקץ אלף מאתים וע' על אותה שעה הוא או' אשרי המחכה לימים אלף . מעשה האותות שיהיו באחרית הימים והמלחמות של ארמילוס וחיל גוג ומלכי האומות שאין להם מספר עמם והן באין ועושין מלחמה עם ישראל ומכין בהם מכה גדולה הכל מפורשים לסירונין:**

A cursory comparison with the different texts of the *Sefer Zerubbabel*⁵⁵ proves that we are dealing here with a version

⁵⁵ Wertheimer, in **לקט מדרשים**, 9 b-13 a, presents a reprint of the Wilna edition, which is based on the *editio princeps*; there follow on f. 13 two fragments from the Genizah; another fragment, according to cod. Oxford 2642⁹ (Cat. II, 37, where it is rightly contended that the second piece, *ib.*, 30, is derived from the **נסתרות דרשב"י**), was published by him previously in **בית המדרש**, II, Jerus. 1894. Jellinek's text

of it. The most convincing proof is afforded by the name **מַחְצִי בָּה** which occurs only in the present apocalypse,⁵⁴ whereas Menahem ben Amiel and Nehemiah ben Hushiel⁵⁷ as names of the Messiah are met with elsewhere. It is true that the version made use of by the compiler differs in many respects from all other known texts; it is for this reason that I thought it desirable to present it in full. It is impossible on this occasion to go into further details. If, then, this apocalypse, along with other mystic writings, had found its way from Italy to Germany and the Rhenish Jews were acquainted with the prediction concerning the advent of the Messiah in the year 958, we can easily understand how they came to address an inquiry to Palestine and how they met with a rebuff, the text occasioning the inquiry being unknown there, or perhaps being regarded of no value.⁵⁸

II. PALTIEL-JAUHAR

One of the most interesting episodes in the history of the family of Ahimaaz of Oria as told in his Chronicle is that of Paltiel, who became vizir of Al-Muizz, the ruler of North Africa, and as such attained great power, at the same time retaining his influence on his coreligionists. As Arabic historians do not speak of any Jewish vizir of Al-

II, 54-57) is based on two Leipsic MSS. Still another text is found, as indicated above, in the *Pirke Hekalot*, ed. Wertheimer. Horowitz, **תּוֹסֶפֶת עֲתִיקָתָא**. I, Frkft. a. M. 1889, p. 24. § 11, No. 16, when speaking of a third version of our book, is perhaps thinking of cod. Oxford 160^o, or codex Casanata 174².

⁵⁶ Thence in Zohar, III, 173 *b*; cf. Wünsche, *Leiden des Messias*, Leipsic 1870, p. 112.

⁵⁷ Dalman, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, 13, n. * * and 20, n. * *; Porjes, *MGWJ.*, XXXIV (1885), 73; also the *Chronicles of Ahimaaz*, 132.

⁵⁸ The *Ebiathar Megillah*, p. 10, l. 1-4, proves that the attitude toward mystic literature was not hostile in the Academy at Jerusalem.

Muizz, Paltiel has been a puzzle to Jewish historians. Kaufmann has treated of him repeatedly.¹ He takes him to be a Nagid of the Egyptian Jews. De Goeje² has identified him with the vizir Jauhar, although a number of traits in the reports concerning the two men appear to militate against such identification. Gottheil,³ accordingly, asserts that this identification is extremely doubtful and with some hesitation makes use of the account concerning Paltiel in constructing a history of the office of the *Nagid*.⁴ Poznański,⁵ without further ado, claims Paltiel as the first *Nagid*, thus apparently wholly rejecting the conjecture of De Goeje. By adducing an account which has hitherto been left unnoticed and which is entirely independent of Ahimaaz, I deem it possible to prove the identification of Paltiel and Jauhar as probable in the highest degree. This account, it is true, is partially obscure; it agrees, however, in details much more exactly with the Arabic accounts concerning Jauhar and is, moreover, free from the gross historical errors perpetrated by Ahimaaz. We find it in the Parma MS. of the *Sefer Hasidim*,⁶ § 545, in connection with an extract from Donnolo's introduction to the חכמוני wherein is narrated the conquest of Oria by the Saracens (925), the slaying of ten scholars of repute and the enslavement of the remaining ones, of whom Paltiel was one.

The text reads as follows: פלטיאל נשבה מעיר אויירם ממדינת
לונברדיאה עם אותם חסידים שנשבו בים בספינות והיה בספינה
זקן אחד ואמר לו לפלטיאל הנער אוי לך כי כדוי שתתגדל אתה

¹ *Die Chronik des Achimaaz von Oria*, 1896, 26 ff., and *ZDMG.*, LI, 436 ff.

² *ZDMG.*, LII, 75-80.

³ *JE.*, V, 61.

⁴ *Ib.*, 68.

⁵ *REJ.*, XLVIII, 145.

⁶ Ed. Wistinetzki, Berlin 1891, 152.

גלינו כי חלמתי והנה אילן גדול מן הארץ ועד לשמים ואתה עולה על ראשו וכשבאו הספינות לנמל נכנס פלטיאל לבית חכם אחד רופא מומחה ויעקב שמו והיה רופא של מלך וזה פלטיאל חריף והיה מפטם בשמים ולמד כל הרפואות לימים מת יעקב החכם והמלך חלה וחש בראשו שלח אחר יעקב ואמרו לו מת ושאל אם הניח בן או תלמיד בא פלטיאל לפניו אמר לו המלך לא אשתה סממניך כי נער אתה אמר לו פלטיאל אמשח רגליך ותזיע ואמרו לו אל המלך זה כובן • וישחק פלטיאל שאל לו המלך למה תלעג עלי הלא אין לשחוק לפני אמר לו הסרים הזה תמיה על משיחת הרגל והיאך נסתרם זה למטה בביציו ונפל לו זקנו מלמעלה: ונתרפא המלך וגידלו למאד לאחר ימים מת המלך והיו לו שנים בנים הבכור שונאו של פלטיאל אמר לו פלטיאל תתגבר ותמלוך כי כל השרים אוהבים אותך חוץ מכושי פלוני אוהב אחיך נשלח אחרינו ונייעצהו להרוג אחיך ובוזה תתרצה לו וכן עשה לימים עסק פלטיאל ונהרג הכושי ונתגדל פלטיאל וביקש מן המלך לבנות בית המקדש והיה מלא אשפה מימות טיטוס הרשע ולא נתן לו המלך רשות לפנותו כי אם עד הצהרים והלך פלטיאל וקיבץ בחורי ישראל והוא בעצמו פינהו עמהם ובנאוהו והיו מתפללים בו ימים רבים ופלטיאל המליך בנו באלכסנדריא ברשות המלך ושם בנו יעקב לימים חוציאו מת והספידו לפני המפקידא⁷ וכשהרגישו הישמעאלים שמלכו יהודי רצו להרוג את יעקב ובא המלך הגדול ורצה לחורשא כולה: ולאחר כמה שנים רצו שני פרנסי ישראל להשתורר זה על זה וליל כפורים היה והכו זה את זה אמר מלך ישמעאלים אמת אין מזל לישראל להתפלל כאן וצוה להחריבה עד יערה רוח ממרום לבנותה בכבודו.

"Now, Paltiel was taken from Oria in Lombardy, together with these pious ones who had been captured at sea. And on the ship there was an old man who said unto young Paltiel, "Woe be unto thee, for it is in order that thou mayest become great, that we are sent into exile. For I

⁷ Read מסגידא mosque?

dreamt a dream that a great tree was growing from earth to heaven, and behold thou wert climbing to the top."

And when the ship reached the harbor, Paltiel went to the house of a certain wise man that was a skilled physician, and Jacob was his name. And he was the King's physician. Now this Paltiel was shrewd and mixed the drugs and learned the uses of all medicines. After many days, Jacob the wise one died, and the King fell ill, and his head troubled him. And he said unto his men to send unto Jacob, but they said unto him that he was dead. And he asked whether he had left a son or a disciple. Then Paltiel came unto him, and he said, "I will not take thy medicines, for thou art but a lad." Then Paltiel said unto him, "I will but anoint thy feet and thou shalt perspire." And they said unto the king, "This man lieth." Then Paltiel laughed aloud, and the King asked him, "Wherefore laughest thou at me? Is it not forbidden to laugh before me?" Then he said unto him, "This eunuch here wondereth at the anointing of feet. Was he not cut below and his beard fell out above?" And the King was cured, and he exalted him greatly.

And after many days, the King died, and he had two sons, and the eldest was an enemy of Paltiel. Then Paltiel said unto him, "Thou wilt obtain the mastery and become king, for all the princes love thee, except a certain Ethiopian, who is a friend of thy brother. Let us send after him and take counsel to kill thy brother. By this you will gain his favor." And he did so. And after many days, Paltiel arranged that the Ethiopian was killed, and Paltiel became exalted.

Thereupon he asked from the King to build the Holy Temple, since this was covered with ashes from the days

of Titus the wicked. But the King would permit it only if he could clear them all away by the middle of the next day. And Paltiel went and gathered all the young men of Israel and he himself worked with them. And thereafter they built it up and prayed there many days. And Paltiel made his son ruler over Alexandria, with the permission of the King. And the name of his son was Jacob. Now, it happened that they were burying a dead man, and they were speaking his praises before the Mosque, and when the Ishmaelites took note that they had made a Jew ruler over them, they wished to kill this Jacob, and the great King came and wished to pass the plough over it. Many years later, two great men of Israel were disputing one with another on the eve of Atonement, and one hit the other, and the King of the Ishmaelites said, "Truly it is no good fortune for the Israelites to pray in this place", and he ordered its destruction, until the Spirit from on High shall arise and rebuild it in all its glory."

In the first place, according to the above account, Paltiel is brought as a slave from Southern Italy to Kairwan where he enters into relations with the Sultan of Kairwan, who must have been Al-Mansur, the father of Al-Muizz. Not a word is said here of the latter's expedition to Italy, of which Ahimaaz reports and which is an impossibility, considering that the expedition took place in 925, whereas Al-Muizz was born only in 929. When Paltiel first meets Al-Mansur, a eunuch takes part in the conversation. All this reminds us of Jauhar who, taken captive in war, was carried away from Southern Italy or Sicily and acquired as a slave by a eunuch who then transferred him to Al-Mansur.

I believe that we have a right to conjecture that the physician Jacob mentioned in the *Sefer Hasidim* and Al-

Mansur's body-physician Isaac Israeli are one and the same person, the Arabic cognomen (*kunya*) of the latter, Abu Ya'qūb, having led to the error. It is true that the supposition is rendered difficult by the statement that the physician Jacob died in advance of the king, whereas Israeli, as is well known, survived Al-Mansur. Too much weight need not, however, be attached to such details, considering the legendary character of the account. By this means a better motive than actually existed was sought to account for the absence of the body-physician and the presence of the stranger.

A very interesting parallel to the episode concerning the medical activity of Paltiel is found in Arabic sources. Wüstenfeld³ reports that Al-Mansur, before his death, a sleeping-potion having been refused him by Isaac Israeli, inquired whether there was no other physician in Kairwan. Upon learning that a young man by the name of Ibrahim had just arrived in the city, he ordered him to be summoned; and the young physician prepared a medicine which the caliph was only required to smell. The desired effect immediately ensued, but it led later to the death of the patient. Israeli then defended the conduct of the stranger, who was about to be attacked, on the ground that he was in no position to know the condition of the patient as well as himself. With the exception of the result of the cure, the parallels between the two accounts are striking. In both a young physician, a stranger, is summoned in obedience to the express desire of the caliph. In both, he prepares a medicine to be used only externally. In the one account, the stranger is regarded as a disciple of Israeli, in the other

³ *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen*, Goettingen 1881, 96.

his conduct is defended by the latter, though, it is true, it remains unclear whether the body-physician was previously acquainted with him or whether he protected him simply on the ground of justice. It may be conjectured that a legendary account concerning Ibrahim has been made to apply to the person of Paltiel.

I find no support for the story concerning the feuds about the throne and the assassination of a brother of Al-Muizz by his chief supporter, an Ethiopian. The data concerning the rebuilding of the Temple may have reference to an old synagogue, presumably at Alexandria⁹.

Paltiel's interest in the rebuilding of the Temple appears to show that, in agreement with the report of Ahimaaz, he openly avowed himself a Jew. On the other hand, we read further on that the Mohammedans became aware only casually of the fact that the government had been placed in the hands of a Jew in the person of Jacob, the son of Paltiel. This would show that both Paltiel and his reputed son Jacob publicly professed themselves Mohammedans. Thus is removed the greatest difficulty which stands in the way of identifying Paltiel with Jauhar; the supposition that Paltiel held the position of *Nagid* also falls to the ground. *Nagid* undoubtedly signifies in this place nothing short of vizir¹⁰.

I identify without hesitation Jacob, the "son" of Paltiel, with the vizir Jacob Ibn Killis to whom, according to Noveiri¹¹, the administration of the country was ceded by

⁹ The additional data concerning this synagogue are obscure. Who is the great king?

¹⁰ Concerning the meaning of the same title borne by Samuel comp. Harkavy's valuable treatise *שמואל הנגיד לתולדות ר' שמעון* in *המאסף*, St. Petersburg 1902, 50; it is to be regretted that it has remained a torso.

¹¹ De Goeje, *l. c.*, 77.

Jauhar after the conquest of Egypt. The fact that the relations of the two vizirs to one another were by no means friendly does not militate against this supposition. The assertion of Ahimaaz that the real son of Paltiel was named Samuel, no less than his remaining genealogical data, deserve absolute credence.

The origin of the account points to Italy. This is above all favored by the connection with the excerpt from Donnolo. The family-tree of R. Judah he-Hasid, the compiler of the *Sefer Hasidim*, equally points to Italy; hence it is probable that his ancestors brought this legend as well as other reminiscences with them from Italy. Presumably a German hand is responsible for placing Oria in Lombardy. Just as our knowledge concerning the personality of the Kabbalist Abu Aaron is derived from the Chronicles of Ahimaaz and from the writings of Eleazar of Worms, the disciple of R. Judah Hasid, our information concerning Paltiel goes back to the same two sources. The memory of their former co-religionist, who was the recipient of high honors, apparently was kept fresh among the Italian Jews for a long time, whereas in Africa he was regarded from the first as a Mohammedan; accordingly the Jewish authors there had no further interest in him.

When the points derived from the accounts mentioned above are put together with the parallels which De Goeje has found between the data of Ahimaaz concerning Paltiel and the Arabic sources concerning Jauhar, the identity of the two may be pronounced as probable in the highest degree.

III. THE *Sefer Metibot*

Among the lost works of the gaonic period, concerning which the most diverse theories have been advanced, is to be reckoned the *Book of the Academies*, which is cited as ספר מתיבות and ספר מתיבתא or more frequently 'בעל מ' and simply מ'. Azulai records the book in his שם הגדולים, II, s. v.; Rapoport², somewhat doubtfully, would ascribe it to R. Hai; Perles³ to R. Samuel b. Hofni. Meklenburg⁴ regards it as a compilation of responsa and decisions by several older Geonim. Harkavy⁵ who has treated of the book in a most thorough manner arrived at similar conclusions; he thinks that notes of a methodological, halakic and exegetical character⁶ made by the heads of the Academies are gathered together in this work. Ginzberg⁷ considers the *Sefer Metibot* as a compilation of gaonic responsa originating in Kairwan. An examination of the numerous quotations from this book in the *Ittur*⁸ (about 55, of which only eight or nine had previously been identified) leads to results at variance with all the opinions mentioned above. The *Sefer Metibot* was a code consisting, like the *Halakot gedolot*, of excerpts from the Talmud and adducing occasionally the opinions of single Geonim; in con-

¹ Abbreviated throughout in this paper to ס"מ and ב"מ.

² Additamenta to the biography of R. Hai in בכורי העתים, 1831, 92; comp. Steinschneider, *Arabische Literatur der Juden*, p. 100, No. 6.

³ *MGWJ.*, IX, 181.

⁴ *Literaturblatt des Orients*, I, col. 357-58. He is followed by Benjacob, *אוצר הספרים*, p. 389, No. 2616.

⁵ זכרון לראשונים וגם לאחרונים, III, St. Petersburg 1886, 28, n. 73; comp. also p. 16, n. 22, and p. 27, n. 71.

⁶ He combines the *Sefer Metibot* with the ספר הישיבה mentioned in the Commentary on Chronicles, ed. Kirchheim, p. 36; there is, however, nothing in common between them. Comp. Ginzberg, *l. c.*, 178, n. 1.

⁷ *Geonica*, I, New York, 1909, 180-81.

⁸ Ed. Schoenblum, Lemberg 1860. In this paper *It.* with accompanying page-number stands for the first part of this edition.

trast to the code just mentioned⁹, it makes ample use of the Palestinian Talmud. All the quotations of which we know at present deal with civil and marriage laws to which the author apparently confined himself.

The large majority of these quotations consists of simple extracts from the Babylonian Talmud, which, as is the case in the *Hal. ged.*, were selected with reference to halakic practice and accordingly are frequently introduced by the formula *ובעל מ' פסק*; comp. *It.*, 7 c, 33 c, 42 b, 43 b, 44 b (*איפסיקא במתיבתא*) and elsewhere. Occasionally the author expressly adds his own decision, as *It.*, 63 c... *וב"מ כתב הלכתא כר*. Whenever he does not incorporate a Talmudic passage, we may accordingly infer that his decision runs counter thereto; comp. *It.*, 8 a *וב"מ*; *אמר ולא אייתי דרב יהודה... דמשמע דלית הלכתא כותיה*; so also 37 c *וב"מ לא אייתי הא... ומשמע דסבירא ליה כר' יוסי*. More interest attaches to a third passage, *It.*, 13 d, where we read: *ובעל מתיבתא דלא אייתי [פלוגתא]*¹⁰ *דרבה ור' זירא סמך על הירושלמי דאייתי בפ' השוכר דכתב' לעיל בדרך התנאי כל המתקיים בפה מתקיים בכתב*. The passage from the Palestinian Talmud,

⁹ The *Halakot gedolot* quote the Palestinian Talmud expressly only once, and in proportion to the bulk of the book the number of acknowledged reminiscences is minimal; comp. the examples in full in Poznański, *Studien zur gaonäischen Epoche*, I, Warsaw 1909, 19-25, and my *Additamenta*, *ZfjhB.*, XIII, 70.

¹⁰ Inserted on the basis of the MS. on parchment from the 14th century in the Sulzberger Collection of the Seminary, which contains fol. 3 b-42 b of the edition and is probably identical with Cat. Rabbinowiz, IX, 66. The manuscript is not always correct; thus frequent errors occur through homoioteleuton. In many passages, it has undergone collation and correction. It could be used to great advantage for the purposes of emending the printed text. As a specimen, the following variants and corrections noted by me casually on the margin of my copy of the printed text may be mentioned here:

It., 13 *a*, is introduced by the formula ירושלמי לבעל מתיבתא, which formula meets us also *It.*, 14 *c*, 21 *a* and 45 *d*. From the present passage we learn that the *Sefer Metibot* was arranged according to the order of the Talmudic pericopes. The Palestinian Talmud is quoted by the author also *It.*, 2 *d*, 42 *b* and in Nahmani on Kid. 59 *a*, B. batra 11 *a*.

	MS.	Edition
5 <i>a</i>	רבינו אבן מגאש ^a	ר' יוסף אבן מ'
5 <i>b</i>	ר' משה בר הנוך ^b	ר' ששת בר מנח
8 <i>d</i>	רבינו שמואל	ר' בן חפני
9 <i>d</i>	במתיבתא נהיגין בר' יהודה	נהיגין במתיבתא דר' יהודה
11 <i>b</i>	מר רב שלום ^c ... ושדרו... ודיוני דבבא ורישי כלה נהיגי למגבי	מר רב נחשון... ושדא... ודיוני דבבל וריש גלותא דלא למגבי
14 <i>b</i>	ובתשובות דאיתשיל קמי רבנן שדרו	בתשובת שאילה דאיתשיל מקמי רבינו שרירא
16 <i>c</i>	ואיתשיל קמי רישי כלה	קמי ריש גלותא
17 <i>a</i>	בהלכות ^d	בהלכות גדולות
21 <i>a</i>	לר' אלפס	לר' האוי
34 <i>b</i>	בהגהה בספר	בהגהה בספרד
34 <i>d</i>	בר' שמואל בן חפני	בר' שמעון ב"ה
38 <i>a</i>	דאבא מרי ז"ל	דה"ר משה דאבא מיון ז"ל
38 <i>c</i>	ולאפסקי הלכתא	ולא ססקינן הילכתא
39 <i>d</i>	ר"ש	ר"ח

^a So he is called throughout the entire book.

^b Müller, *Responsen der span. Lehrer*, 29, n. 15, has conjecturally emended the text in this manner; in *Litbl. des Orients*, X, 198, on the basis of קורא הדורות, the scholar is accordingly proclaimed to have been a brother of R. Moses b. Hanok!

^c Comp. the parallel passages *fol.* 44 *d* and כתובות on מאה שערים § 25, in Alfasi ed. Wilna.

^d *sc.* of Alfasi.

Of the second part of the *Ittur* there is found in the same Collection a paper MS. of the 16th century, 47 leaves 4°, corresponding to *fol.* 20 *b*-34 *d* of the printed edition. The copyist notes on *fol.* 3 *b* that a leaf of the manuscript of which his was a transcript had been partially destroyed by mice; on the other hand, he did not realize that in that copy two leaves had been interchanged, *fol.* 38 *a*, l. 4 from below—38 *b* end and *fol.* 42 *a*, l. 9 from below—42 *b*, l. 6 from below, the context thus being interrupted in the passages in question. The MS. was acquired by Halberstam (cod. 482) from Cat. Rabbinowiz, IX, No. 67; some of the following variants and corrections were noted down by him in his copy of the Lemberg edition:

The number of gaonic quotations is very limited.¹¹ I have met with such only in (1) *It.*, 24 a: וב"מ משמיה דרב כהן: 24 a: *It.*, 24 a: צדק גאון מנהג דילן למיכל בנכיתא וביומי דר' שמעון קיירא הכי נהוג... According to Epstein¹², the quotation from the *Halakot*

	MS.	Edition
20 b	בספר אלקודון בברצילונא	אלקודין
21 b	בתשובה ישראל שנישטמד	שנישטמה נכרי
21 a	ובישיבת מר רב כהן צדק	ובתשובת
22 a	והלכות פסוקות ורבוותא קמאי [כגון רב אחא] והלכות פסקי	
ib.	ובתשובה לר' האיו ז"ל.. רבנן קמאי [דמתיבתא]	
ib.	רש"י	רבינו שלם
22 c	שבסורא בשתי ישיבות... [ולא] מסתברא	שבסורא
22 d	ר"ת במילה ובברכות ירושלמי	בה' מילה ובהלכות
23 c	[ואמר הרב המחבר זצ"ל דאפקיה מהילכתא משום טעמא דשירטוט] ומשום דגרסינן בירושלמי תפילין וספרים	
23 d	ותזי' לרבינו [האיו] בהלכות תפילין	
24 a	בשמושא רבה	דכתבי' שארכה
25 b	למד מדבריו רבינו [האיו] ז"ל	
27 a	בכלהי גרסאות בהלכות [תפילין] עתיקא	בה"ג
ib.	אבל רב עמרם אפי' לארבעה לחמשה שנים ובשאלה [לבריה] דרבינו נחשון	למ' שנה
29 b	ומר רב אובמא	אבימי
32 a	וסברא דר"י ז"ל [ודעת ר' יעקב בתשובה שהשיב לפני א"מ]	
32 c	והרב הקדוש קרובנו	רבנו
33 a	הרב [יעחק] בן מרן הלוי	
34 c	ורב עמרם בתשובות וסדר המשנה	

Fol. 46 of the MS. contains, under the heading כללי הטריפות לרבינו , the matter incorporated in the *Ittur*, II, 20 ab, up to 20 b, l. 11. In the place of what follows we find here a קצר כלל beginning with הריאה שניקבה . The last leaf contains של הרב ר' מאיר בר ברוך מרוטנבורק נ"ע.

These few examples chosen at random show, considering the important quotations, how urgent is the need of a new edition of the *Ittur* on the basis of manuscripts. Even the keenest ingenuity is insufficient for the purposes of emending this badly corrupt text.

¹¹ Passages like *It.* 55 b בשאילתא דמתיבתא and בתשובת דמתיבתא very likely have no reference to our book at all.

¹² הגרן, III, p. 6, No. 7. מאמר על הלכות גדולות

Gedolot is likewise derived from the *Sefer Metibot*: (2) *ib.* וכתב ב"מ משמיה דר' יעקב גאון ההוא דמישכן חצר או כרם ומנכה למאן (also *ספר תרומות*, in porta 46, part 3, fol. 226 b, ed. Ven.). A third quotation to which Rapoport long ago drew attention is much more important. We read fol. 16 c: וכן מצאתי לבעל מתיבות (מתיבות) עתיקא למאי נפקא מינה להולך לאו כזכי שאם אמר לשליח הולך גט זה לאשתי רצה לבטלו [מבטלו] מכלל דאי אמר ליה זכי [גט] זה לאשתי אינו יכול לבטלו וזו היא הוראת רבינו ואבינו ראש ישיבה גאון יעקב שער ישיבה של ימין והורה תיקון שלא יהא הבעל יכול לבטל גט לאשתו וכן מצאתי: ¹³ Fol. 34 c, this passage is once more referred to. It is regrettable that the passage is very obscure and thus does not aid in clarifying our problem. It is uncertain whether an old MS. of the *ס"מ* or an entirely different work¹⁴ is meant; nor are we in a position to determine who the *ראש ישיבה* mentioned is, whether the author's father¹⁵ is meant or whether we are dealing with a quotation from a responsum. שער is also found in the Gaonic Responsa, ed. Harkavy, No. 551, p. 273. Rapoport makes the phrase refer to *Pumbaditha*, Harkavy to *Sura*.

In Nahmani's commentary¹⁶ on *Abodah Zarah* 21 b we read: אבל בעל מתיבות רב האי ז"ל מצאתי; consequently Rapoport wanted to ascribe the work to R. Hai. Against this supposition, Bodek in *הרואה*, II, 143, has pointed to the reading found in R. Nissim's

¹³ Rapoport failed to notice that *ב"מ הישן* and *ב"מ עתיקא* are identical.

¹⁴ It is certain that the author did not find it in the MS. of the *ס"מ* employed by him elsewhere. Meklenburg's supposition that *ב"מ עתיקא* denotes the supreme head of the academy cannot be accepted.

¹⁵ Perhaps *ואדונינו* should be emended to read *ואבינו*. The expression *ואבינו* is peculiar; it is nevertheless found also in the MS.

¹⁶ In *מעשי צדיקים*, Leghorn 1779, fol. 6 a.

commentary on Alfasi, שבת XVI towards the end, and Meklenburg to the parallel passage on ע"ז I towards the end; Harkavy has added another reference to Aaron ha-Kohen's ארחות חיים I, 54, § 307. In all three passages the quotation reads: הרב בעל מתיבות ז"ל כתב . . . ובשם רבינו האי: האזן ז"ל מצאתי (or כתבו). It is inconceivable how Harkavy in spite of all this can propose to amend Nahmani ב"מ .[ל]בעל מתיבות [שהביא] ר' האי ז"ל mentioned *It.*, 14 c by the side of a joint responsum by R. Sherira and R. Hai, 15 c by the side of R. Hai; in contrast to the latter Gaon it occurs in Nahmani on Gittin 63 b.

Another equally corrupt passage in Nahmani on Gittin¹⁷ 66 b, which Zunz¹⁸ was the first to point out, has led to the attribution of the ס"מ to R. Samuel b. Hofni. The phrase וכן סדרן רב שמואל [בן] חפני בס' המתיבות, however, is probably to be emended וס' המתיבות¹⁹. Harkavy²⁰ proposes the reading בשם ס' המ', with an appeal to Nahmani on נטין 63 b; the passage, however, was known to him only from the quotation in יד מלאכי which has suffered corruption through misconception. We read there as a matter of fact that, in the case of a conflict between Rab and R. Hanina, R. Hai Gaon²¹, like Alfasi and R. Hananel, decided in favor of R. Hanina: ורב שמואל בן חפני גאון ז"ל הכי: כתב שלא תקבלנו שלוחה מיד שליח הבעל כרב ובעל מתיבות הכי ס' לוקאמר דכל רב ור' חנינא הלכה כרב²². The whole passage

¹⁷ In חמש שיטות, Sulzbach 1762, fol. 74 b below.

¹⁸ *Ges. Schriften*, III, 133; comp. Perles, *l. c.*

¹⁹ In the same manner, we should read with Harkavy, n. 71, in Nahmani on ב"ב 11 a: בעלי התוספות [ו]המתיב.

²⁰ Note 71; comp. note 22.

²¹ Thus R. Hai is here at variance with the ס"מ; comp. Ginzberg, 181, n. 1.

²² The passage is also found *It.* 17 a, where the words of R. Samuel are given more fully.

is regarded by R. Malachi Kohen as a quotation from R. Samuel b. Hofni, who thus would be quoting the מ"ם; but Azulai has noted²³ that Nahmani himself quoted here the מ"ם, and not R. S. b. Hofni. It appears to me hazardous to conclude on the basis of this single passage that the מ"ם contained methodological rules²⁴. Such general remarks occur occasionally in all codes; the present remark recurs *verbatim* also in the ספר הפני²⁵, which is of a similar character. Lastly I would point out that *It.*, 38 *b*, the opinion of R. Samuel b. Hofni is contrasted with that of מ"ם. On the basis of the quotations extant it will therefore not do to prove the existence of relations between מ"ם and R. Hai or R. Samuel b. Hofni; nor by such argumentation to fix the date of the author casually²⁶ designated by Nahmani as a *Gaon*.

Equally doubtful is the use made by Alfasi of the מ"ם, as שמא מצא הרב ז"ל on Yebamot 109 *b* assumes (לבעל מתיבות), especially as Alfasi is frequently at variance with the מ"ם, comp. *It.*, 17 *a*, 31 *a*, 42 *b*, 45 *d*. Of course, occasionally the two agree, as e. g., *It.*, 21 *b*, where the opinion of both is rejected (ולא בריר לן). Frequently, the מ"ם is cited by the side of R. Hananel, now the one, now the other being named first, so that, despite Rapoport's attempts to the

²³ In עין זוכר, Leghorn 1793, fol. 40 *c* (ח § 31; quoted by Harkavy, n. 73). Azulai retracts this statement, having found in רשב"א *ad locum*: אבל בעל הלכות פסק כרב וכן ר' שמואל בן מפני [חופני ז.]. פסק כרב וקאמר בל רב ור' חנינא הלכה כרב. It is probable that we should read מתיבות in the place of הלכות and that the whole is corrupted from Nahmani cited in the immediately preceding passage. No importance is to be attached to this in view of the combined testimony of the *It.* and Nahmani. Harkavy should therefore not have ascribed the sentence: כל רב ור' חנינא... on p. 2 to R. S. b. H.

²⁴ Harkavy, *l. c.*

²⁵ סמ"ג, Prohibition III, fol. 36 *d*, ed. Ven., 1547.

²⁶ מ"ם הזכות, § 52, on גטין IV, ed. Leghorn, 1745, fol. 45 *d*-46 *a*.

contrary, nothing can be concluded from the order in which the names appear; comp. *It.*, 1 *b*, 7 *a*, 12 *c*, 16 *b*, 24 *c*, 43 *b*, 45 *d*. In the last reference but one, where both agree, the decision is rejected exactly as 33 *a*.

Though all positive criteria for a determination of the date of our author prove futile, I take it that we shall not go amiss in placing the date of the composition of the מ"ס towards the end of the gaonic period, hence about the year 1000. A later date is, to mention nothing else, precluded by the title. The apparently extensive use made of the Palestinian Talmud²⁷ renders it improbable that the author wrote his work in Babylonia, though it must be granted that at that period and even in that country the Palestinian Talmud did not remain wholly unnoticed.²⁸ It must also be remembered that the works of the gaonic Academies had become known in wide circles, which was not the case with the מ"ס. This latter consideration likewise militates against Kairwan as the place where the book was written; for the literary productions of the latter place were widely disseminated, and yet the very authors that maintained the closest relations with Kairwan and were most intimately acquainted with the writings that originated there, know nothing of our book. Moreover, almost all the quotations, with the exception of those in Nahmani and Isaac b. Abba Mare, are derived from secondary sources²⁹. Thus the three citations in Estori ha-Parhi's כפתור ופרח³⁰ are derived from the *Ittur*, viz. p. 161

²⁷ Ginzberg, *l. c.*, 181, was the first to notice it.

²⁸ Comp. the studies of Poznański mentioned above, 27-32, and my *Additamenta in ZfhB.*, XIII, 70-71.

²⁹ Concerning the מ"ס האשכול comp. Ginzberg, *l. c.*, 180, n. 4.

³⁰ Jerusalem 1897-99.

= *It.*, 16 b; p. 169³¹=*It.*, 58 b; p. 322=*It.*, 11d. Of the two citations in the תשובות ס' one (VI, 1; fol. 40 d) goes back to Nahmani's הוכות ס', and the other, as previously noted³², to the *Ittur*. The one citation³³ which we find in Aaron ha-Kohen's ארחות חיים³⁴ and in R. Nissim b. Reuben, is also found in Nahmani, from whom the sole citation in R. Solomon b. Adret, we may assume, was likewise derived, so long as no further citations are forthcoming in this as well as in the other authors named. There remain then only the excerpts in the *Pardes*.

I deem it as most probable that we possess in the ס"מ a Palestinian code, the only one of its kind, except the Sheeltot. As Ginzberg³⁷ has shown, the Babylonian Talmud was in those days regarded as authoritative even in Palestine. With the Palestinian authorship, on the other hand, the use made of the Palestinian Talmud and the slight popularity of the book go well. Of the authors acquainted with the ס"מ, Nahmani lived at a later period of his life in Palestine; the *Pardes*³⁸ betrays on other

³¹ Not in the Index, p. 796. Harkavy is of the opinion that the quotation from מ' was derived from the תשובות cited there. It may be noted in passing that in the *Ittur*, מבירת קרקעות, R. Moses b. Hanok is named; very likely it represents an independent quotation of the *Ittur*.

³² גידולי תרומה, Venice.

³³ See above note 26.

³⁴ See above p. 90.

³⁵ See above p. 91.

³⁶ Is wanting in Schlesinger's Index, ארחות חיים, II 652.

³⁷ *l. c.*, 4, n.

³⁸ Comp. Epstein, *MGHJ.*, XLVII (1903), 344 (the responsum treated of there was known also to רא"ש on ר"ה IV and ליקוטיוס מהלכות אמרכל, fol. 22 c; comp. also *Ma'asch ha-Geonim*, 1910, p. 37) and הגרן, VI, 69-73; and on the other hand Aptowitz, *REJ.*, LVII, 249-51.

In this connection we may likewise point to the Palestinian responsa in the compilation שיערי צדק, fol. 15 a, 30 a, 69 b, 83 a and 92 b. Comp. also Kobak's וישורון, VI, 124 ff.; *Geonica*, II, 50 ff.; *MGHJ.*, XX (1871), p. 124, n. 2.

occasions its familiarity with Palestinian sources; the same may perhaps be said of the *Ittur*, and it remains to be investigated whether expressions in this work, not met with elsewhere, as תשובות ראשי הישיבות, I, 33 a, 52 d, and לראש ישיבה³⁹ 15 d, may not perhaps point to Palestine.

Once we are convinced that the *Sefer Metibot* really originated there, we may advance a step further and identify the work with the *Compendium of the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmud* which the Karaite Jeshua b. Judah made use of in Jerusalem about 1050. Jeshua states⁴⁰: ראיתי: למקצת חכמי הרבנים מי קיצר שני התלמודים של ארץ ישראל ושל שנער. This would be a very good description of the *Sefer Metibot* which on the whole consisted of extracts from the two Talmuds. Jeshua may have taken the title "Book of the Academies", which is general enough, as an appellation; he designated the work according to its contents. At all events it appears to me as certain that the ס' מתיבות was an abstract of the Talmud⁴¹ after the manner of the *Halakot Gedolot*. I subsequently found partial substantiation of this supposition in the statement in Margoliouth's Cat. British Museum, II, 128, that in 1462 an

³⁹ Comp. לערי צדק *It.*, 6 b, 42 c, 45 c, 54 d; *Responsa* אמ' ראש מתיבתא 21; *Geonica*, II, 239, l. 21; *Halakot gedolot*, ed. Hildesheimer, p. 483 זה פירוש ראש ישיבה; Alfasi, *Rosh ha-shanah* IV מתיבתא ריש מקמי שאלו; Pardes, ed. Const., f. 44 b, ed. Warsaw, § 178 מצאתי בתשובות ראשי ישיבות 61 d, § 25, this expression refers to the Babylonian Geonim; in *Responsa*, ed. Lyck, No. 45³⁵, p. 19, אמר ריש מנהג דמושק refers to Jehudai Gaon. *It.* II, 2 d, mention is made of וסביבותיה; but the knowledge of the latter the author probably owed to the Joseph Ibn Plat adduced *ib.*, 18 c, who for a time had been a member of the Damascene Academy before he returned to Southern France. Comp. Epstein, *MGHJ.*, XI, IV (1900), 289 ff.

⁴⁰ ס' העריות, ed. Markon, St. Petersburg 1900, 149, 150; comp. my review *OLZ.*, XII, 414.

⁴¹ Hence it is that Isaac b. Abba Mare speaks in נזקין on מאה שערים No. 51. of the מתיבות דבעל נוסחא.

unbound copy of the part נשים of the so-called *Sefer Metibot*⁴² was sold in Corfu.

Peculiar as is the name of the book, it oscillates between 'מתיבות' and 'מתיבתא'; both appellations appear to be used quite indiscriminately, and it is impossible to follow Meklenburg's proposal to effect a distinction according to the Hebrew or the Aramaic form of the name. Thus the *Ittur* has 'מתיבות' where the *Ittur* reads 'מתיבתא'; the above mentioned MSS. belonging to the New York Seminary differ in this respect more than a dozen times from the edition, and the *Pardes*⁴³ introduces its excerpts by the formulae 'מתיבתא... ותו כתב במתיבות... ותו כתב...'. It is difficult to say how the work received its title. Was the author perhaps a Babylonian by birth and did he desire to point to the source of his knowledge through the title of his work? Ginzberg⁴⁴ holds that the gaonic opinions in the work were introduced by some such formula as 'ושדרו ממתיבתא'; this expression, however, is to be met with nowhere in the known citations; nor is it permissible to derive the gaonic responsa thus introduced from our work, for, e. g., *Itt.*, 38 b, an opinion thus introduced is found in contrast to that of the 'מתיבות'.

In closing, I may be permitted to put together such quotations found in Nahmani, *Ittur*⁴⁵, etc., as I am familiar with. I am quite certain that in a cursory examination of

⁴² ספר הנקרא מתיבות נשים בלי טבלאות.

⁴³ Ed. Constantiropole, 1802, fol. 21 c-d, ed. Warsaw, § 297; it is wanting in the Index in Buber's Introduction to *Ha-Orah*, 118.—The circumstance that our book has been ignored in a number of Indices is sufficiently explained by its peculiar title. Hence it is extremely probable that quotations may be extant in a number of authors which have hitherto escaped the attention of scholars.

⁴⁴ l. c., 180.

⁴⁵ Indirect citations have not been included.

the closely printed book some have escaped my attention; nevertheless I believe that the material collected will suffice to substantiate my theory concerning the character of the book. I have read the second part up to the middle only, and, presumably because the *Sefer Metibot* contained only **ריני נשים ונוזיקין**, found nothing there beyond two citations with reference to **ברכת חתנים** fol. 27 b⁴⁶. It is, however, unnecessary to copy the quotations, which for the most part are well-known Talmudic passages. Perhaps an investigation of the Talmudic text employed by the author might go a long way towards definitely establishing the origin of the book; but for an investigation of this sort we lack both material and preliminary investigations. The readings of the **ס"מ** frequently differ from those of R. Hananel and Alfasi, and on 7 d⁴⁷ the learned commentator, R. Meir Jonah⁴⁸, remarks that the passage is wanting in our edition of the Talmud. The passage, which I give in note 47, belongs to Gitṭin 22 a above; the most ancient commentators, however, did not find it there.

The **ספר מתיבות** is quoted by:

R. Isaac b. Abba Mare in עטור I, 1 a, 7 c, 7 d, 8 a, II a⁴⁹, II b, 12 c, 12 d, 13 a, 13 d, 14 c (bis), 15 c, 15 d (bis),

⁴⁶ The passage reads in the MS. referred to: **ובעל מתיבתא אמר ואמר לנו את ארוסתינו והתיר לנו נשואותינו ע"י חופה וקידושין בא"י מקדש ישראל: ס"א ואמר לנו כל הקרובות והרחוקות הארוסות והנשואות והתיר לנו את הפנויות ע"י חופה בקידושין בא"י מקדש ישראל: ומנחגא למיחתם ע"י חופה וקידושין ומסתברא כבעל מתיבתא דאמר ע"י חופה בקידושין**.

⁴⁷ **ובעל מתיבתא כתב איבעי להו עציץ שאינו נקוב מאי ת"ש עציץ נקוב מקדש בכרם שאינו נקוב אינו מקדש. ר"ש אומר זה וזה אסורין ואינן מקדשין**.

⁴⁸ ל"א. I, Warsaw 1883, fol. 26 b, n.

⁴⁹ The MS. reads here: **לבעל מתיבות בית דין אלימי למיעבד שודא** (in the place of **בית הגדול**).

16 *b*, 16 *c*, 17 *a*, 21 *a*, 21 *b* (*bis*), 21 *d*, 22 *a*, 24 *a*, 24 *c*, 24 *d*, 27 *b*, 29 *c*, 31 *b*, 32 *b*, 33 *a*, 33 *c*, 34 *c*, 37 *c*, 38 *b*, 39 *b*, 42 *b* (*bis*), 43 *b*, 43 *d*, 44 *b*, 45 *b*, 45 *d* (*bis*), 51 *a*, 51 *c*, 51 *d*, 52 *b*, 55 *d*, 57 *a*, 58 *b*, 63 *c*, 64 *a*; II, 27 *b* (*bis*);

Id. in מאה שערים on Alfasi, ed. Wilna, נשים, No. 3, 19, 35⁵⁰; נזיקין, No. 2, 21, 33, 37⁵¹, 51;

Nahmani in the חידושים on גטין 63 *b*, 66 *b*; קידושין 59 *a*; בבא בתרא 11 *a*; and עבודה זרה 21 *b*;

Id. in ספר הזכות on גטין IV towards the end (§ 52);

Pardes, ed. Constantinople, fol. 21 *c-d* (three times);

R. Solomon b. Adret in the חידושים on יבמות 109 *b*.

P. S.—Since sending this paper to the press I have received several communications solving some of the difficulties I have touched upon above. Prof. Büchler (Nov. 2, 1909) was kind enough to look up the reading of Nahmani on Gittin 66 *b* (above, note 17) in codex Halberstam 55, f. 101 *b*, and found there: וכן סדרן רבן שמואל גאון [בן] חפני; the quotation therefore belongs to Ibn Hofni's Introduction to the 'Talmud.

In Nahmani on Baba Batra 11 *a* (see note 19) cod. Hebr. 75 in Munich reads simply: (read כתבו) וכן כתבו; בעל המתיבות; the word התוספות is missing altogether, as Dr. Ehrentreu was good enough to inform me (Oct. 25, 1909). The word is evidently a dittograph.

As to the אשכול (see note 29), Mr. Albek, who is preparing a new edition of it, kindly sent me (Nov. 2, 1909) the following quotations, which oc-

⁵⁰ = It. 16*b*. Many more passages may occur in the *Ittur*, just as many passages in the *Ittur* are repeated in that very book and recur also in Nahmani. I have paid no attention to repetitions in the list given above.

⁵¹ In Baba batra the notes peculiarly enough are not numbered; they amount to 12. In Baba mesia the last note is numbered as 28, in Sanhedrin the first as 45. Four notes appear to be wanting in the edition.

cur in הלכות צדקה (Cod. Carmoly, f. 205 b), and should be added to the above: ודקדק בעל מתיבות בהא דתני רב: שמואל בר יהודה אין פוסקין צדקה על היתומים אפלו לפדיון שבויים מכלל דעל אחריני פוסקין על ברחייהו כל חד וחד לפום מאן דחזי ליה. ותו פסק ורשאין בני העיר להתנות כל מה שיראה אצל מלכות יהא נותן כך וכך וכל מקח שבא בעיר נהיה כולנו שותפין בו.

IV. FRAGMENTS OF HAI GAON'S WRITINGS

1. Of the three fragments which are published here, the first is of considerable importance, as it gives us information concerning a work by Hai not otherwise known. It belongs to the Codex Steinschneider 29, which for the most part contains liturgical fragments. The conclusion of the letter which we are about to discuss is found on leaves 19-20; originally, however, it formed the beginning of the fragment, the nine following leaves containing a letter from Fostat to Sana'a of the year 1062 which I propose to publish at some future date in the continuation of the present *Studies*. I shall then also describe the MS. more minutely; for the present comp. the short notice by Steinschneider, *ZfhB.*, VI, 158; he did not then recollect that he possessed the MS. himself in the codex designated by him as פיוטים. In *ZfhB.*, XIII, 72, I have published an extract in connection with a review of Poznański's *Studien zur gaonäischen Epoche I*. I give here the whole fragment, since it is comparatively short.

It was the letter accompanying a number of responsa in reply to inquiries by R. Jacob b. Nissim, who is designated as החבר, not yet as אלוף. Apparently the writers were Sherira and Hai together, for in the course of it, it is strongly emphasized that Hai alone was the author of a *Methodology of the Talmud* written for R. Jacob which would soon follow. To the inquiries of R. Jacob we owe, as is well known,

the famous Epistle of Sherira as well as a few supplementary responsa. We learn here that he likewise prompted the composition of an Introduction to the Talmud which was written in Arabic and calculated to serve as a guide even for beginners.

Less clear is the beginning of the letter, where mention is made of the fact that something had been sent along with a letter of R. Jacob to R. Jacob אֶלְיָהוּ b. Joseph, who is greatly eulogized by the writers, but who is otherwise quite unknown. The latter was one of the foreign scholars that visited the Academies in the closing period of the Gaonate, returned to his native country and there evinced great zeal on behalf of the Academy. The writers seem to have selected him for some purpose, since he was acquainted with the condition of the academy and had prompted certain institutions (תַּקְנוֹת). He may perhaps have been appointed representative of the academy¹ to whom contributions for the academy were to be sent and to whom likewise inquiries were to be addressed which he was to send on. If this be the case, the beginning of the fragment must have contained an exhortation that money as well as R. Jacob's answer should be sent by his agency. This part of the letter accordingly concludes with the words בֵּן עָשׂוּ וְלֹא תַעֲדְרוּ.

According to a letter of R. Samuel b. Hofni² sent to Kairwan, a similar position seems to have been held in Egypt by a certain Joseph b. Jacob אֶלְיָהוּ, who, according to a plausible conjecture by Poznański³, was a son of the

¹ Comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 2, n.

² Ed. G. Margoliouth, *JQR.*, XIV, 308 f., comp. 621; Poznański, *Schechter's Saadyana*, 5, n.

³ *Studien*, I, 57, where a reference to Cat. Oxford II 2877⁵, 9, 18; 2875³¹ ought to be added to note 4. A considerable period seems to have elapsed between the two letters; in the first Hai is אב"ד, the second was written after the death of Sherira.

Jacob above mentioned. While the father took care of the interests of the then sole academy at Pumbaditha, the son (during his father's life-time) seems to have represented both. It is quite possible that the beginning of our letter may be extant in the Firkowitz collection of MSS. at St. Petersburg.

שלוחה עם אגרת מר רב יעקב החבר נר אל אצילנו נכבדינו
 ידידנו איש בריתנו מרי ורבנא יעקב אלוף-ינצרהו משגבינו ויגוננהו
 בן מרי ורבנא יוסף עובל זכ לב כי יש לו חמלה על אשר לישיבה לפי
 חכמתו ותבונתו ויראתו מן השמים ולא בחרנו בו אילא כי ראה כבוד
 התורה וישב בצלה וידע את חכמי הדור ההוא ואמנם בצאתו מבבל
 נעצבנו אנו והחכמים קרובנו כי כאחד מהם היה בתוכה ואלהים שלחו
 לפניהם לשום להם שארית בארץ ולהחיות להם לפליטה גדולה כי
 בהעיר יוי את רוחו היו התקנות האלה וחסדיו עלינו ועל החכמים
 רבים מלספור המקום ישלם לו ולכם כן עשו ולא תעדרו . והנה
 כתבנו תשובות השאלות הנפלאות והמיוקרות אשר כתב מר רב יעקב
 החבר נט רח וחיוץ מהן הנה (I b) חֲבֵרְנו אֲנַחְנו אֵיִי אֵב בֵּית דִּין
 כתב בלשון ישמעאלים חלוק לכמה שערים בישור דרכי התלמוד
 ובהלכותיו והליכותיו אשר הוא מורה דרך ואפילו למגשש ברחמי
 אלהים וישבו כמה דמיונות מכל שערי סוגיא דשמעתא משרי קטרין
 ופוצה אחרין והנה אנחנו שולחים אותו להחבר נר אחרי זאת כי
 בשמו חברנוהו ולועשינוהו ונותר בו כמעט והוא יוצא אליו ואף על פי
 כן כי אדיר גדול הוא ורב מובהק אלא שגם זאת לשרתה ויוי יפיק
 זממכם על דבר אמת ועם הצדק ימלא משאלותיכם ושלומכם ירבה
 לעד . ישע רב.

2. R. Hai's poem for circumcisions is derived from *fol. 2 b* of the Genizah fragment of the 'T-S LOAN', where it follows an Arabic letter by Ephraim b. Azariah (ידיע בן) and Ezekiel ha-Kohen ב. Ali ha-

⁴ I owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Schechter for his kindness in permitting the publication of this fragment.

Kohen; Dr. Israel Friedländer intends to prepare the latter for publication.

3. R. Hai's poem addressed to an otherwise totally unknown Hazzan Abraham b. Isaac b. מלקטה is derived from a MS. in the possession of Mr. Elkan N. Adler of which I use a transcript made by Mr. I. Last. The acrostic of the poem does not yield the name of the author, but that of the gentleman to whom it was addressed, concerning whom the now missing conclusion of the poem may have contained further information. The MS. contains in addition a poem with the acrostic שמע קולי וענה ענה ענה : שמואל, as well as a third with the undistinguished acrostic שיחי שאי סור סיה beginning with שהלאן לוף חוק, עליחה סברי; a verse is probably missing, and the author שהלאן אלוף is identical with the שהלאן ראם אלכל noted in Steinschneider's *Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews*⁵ from another fragment in the possession of Mr. Adler, and in *JQR.*, XIX, 738, by the late Mr. Ernest Worman⁶.

The significance of those two poems, irrespective of the fact that we learn a new name belonging to the gaonic period, consists primarily in the circumstance that, with the exception of the poem on Ibn 'Ata of Kairwan published by Magid in הצפירה and the poem published in *Gconica* II,

⁵ *JQR.*, XI, 315, No. 449.

⁶ Poznański, *Studien*, I, 49; comp. *ib.* 50. The Bodleian Library has several liturgical compositions by this poet; see Cat. II, Index, s. v. Sahlan. 2738¹¹ acrostic שהלאן בר אברהם אלוף והחבר and שהלאן ראש כל occur. In 2875^{13b} probably ראש כלה is to be supplied after שהלאן. Poznański (letter of Nov. 24, 1909) thinks it possible, that שהלאן ראש כלה בן ברהון החבר in 2876² is also identical with the above and that אברהם = ברהם = ברהון, cf. Schecchter's *Saadyana*, 8.

these two are the only authentic specimens of Hai's poetry which we possess. Everything else that has been ascribed to him in this province is spurious. In spite of our meager knowledge, it may be conjectured that Hai was rather productive even as a poet; and when the liturgical pieces of the Genizah come to be examined, we shall undoubtedly recover many another piece from the pen of the last Gaon.

In cod. Oxford 2852^s is found the last line of his סליחות
with the subscription נגזו סליחות רבינו האיי גאון נטר אללה
״. In Cod. 2742^{13p} a piece⁸ is ascribed to רבינו האי
which, according to Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 186, and
Synagogale Poesie, 41, actually belongs to Joseph ibn
Abiṭur, despite the fact that the concluding lines of the
acrostic yield האי. The same acrostic is contained in Cod.
Oxf. 2742^{13r} and 2737^{E4} beginning with אכן סר מר המות
נמתק מדבש היטיב, and in the latter MS. two סליחות the be-
ginning of which is missing (E 5 and 6 are both alphabetic).

Texts 2 and 3 read as follows:

TEXT 2

ה' מלכינו למולה ושבת
מן קול ר' האיי גאון זק"ל
§
פי' ה' דְּבַר · חיל עמו לגבר:
חוק להם שִׁיבֵר
בריתו
להודיעם:
ציצית שֶׁם בלתי · ומוזוה בפתח ·
וטוטפות בתותח
בראשם

¹ Catalogue, II, col. 327.—It is noteworthy that סליחות by Joseph Ibn Abitur follow here upon those of Hai, just as the responsa of both men have come down to us quite frequently in the same compilations.

⁸ את מי זנחת, printed in Avignon, fol. 33 b; Zunz, *Synagoga Poesie*, l. c.

ובזרועם :

להעטותם עדיים . . . מקום עורות
גדיים וחישורים גלויים .

וזהב לא יועם :

ברית מילה כחותם . בשרם

TEXT 3

אחר לארוננו האיי

נאון ז"ל על שם ר'

אברהם בן יצחק

בן מלקטה החזון

אָמָה אִשֶּׁר שׁוֹלַחַה בְּמוֹ בֶּשֶׁת

בִּזְכָּה כְּמוֹ רַחֲקָה כְּמִטְחֹוִי קֶשֶׁת

ר' . . . גְּבִירָה מְנוֹרֶדֶת וְנוֹטָ[שֶׁת]

הָיוּ נִמְאָסָה נִחְשָׁבָה שְׂפַחָה מְנוֹרֶשֶׁת

מִפָּה וּמִפָּה

בְּתִי אֲדוֹמָה וְשְׂפַחָה לֹא מִחִפְשֶׁת

נִתְיַצְבוּ נִתְחַבְּרוּ עַל מִצְבֵּי רֶשֶׁת

יִחַדְיוּ יִכְלוּ כְּמוֹ בִּימֵי יְרוּבֶשֶׁת

צִי רְאוּהָ לִשְׂבָּא וּלְפִלְשֶׁת

חֲמָה כְּמוֹ יַעֲטוּ לַמֶּלֶךְ לְתַלְבוֹשֶׁת

קִינִי

בְּרִית

(To be continued)

POETIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE GENIZAH

BY ISRAEL DAVIDSON,

Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

It is more than seventy years since Franz Delitzsch gave for the first time an historical account of the development of post-Biblical Hebrew poetry. During the three generations that have passed since the appearance of his memorable work: "*Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*" (Leipzig, 1836), many new names were added to the list of ancient Hebrew poets and not a few important works brought to light, and the feeling was current that the time had already become ripe for a similar work on a larger scale. But with the discovery of the Genizah, the conviction has come upon us that until this new mine of Jewish lore is thoroughly explored every branch of Mediæval Jewish literature—poetry not excepted—will have to wait for its history, or risk being premature. The discoverer of the Genizah has himself shown us by his numerous publications what a vast amount of new information we may expect to find in it relating to the most obscure periods in Jewish history and literature. With this conviction firmly fixed in mind, we cannot help but value even the smallest contribution coming from this ancient source, and it is in this spirit that the following fragments are here presented.¹

¹ I take this opportunity of thanking Prof. Schechter for placing these fragments at my disposal.

I. QUOTATIONS FROM "MAHZOR YANNAI."

In his biography of Kalir, Rapoport was the first to draw our attention to the existence of an ancient Payyetan by the name of Yannai whom he found mentioned in a responsum of Rabbi Gershom, cited in the *Shibbole Halleket* of Zedekiah ben Abraham Anaw.² In this passage Yannai is named before Kalir and is described as "one of the early sages who composed Kerobot for every order of the year".³ A dozen years later,⁴ while still engaged in his polemic with Luzzatto about the time and place of Kalir, Rapoport brought forth the additional information, given him by Zunz, that in a certain liturgical MS.,⁵ just preceding the Kerobot of the "Great Sabbath", a note was added, perhaps by Ephraim of Bonn⁶, saying, that the poem **אוני פטרי רחמים** was taken for the composition of Yannai the teacher of Kalir, and that the people of Lombardy refrained from reciting it because of a legend which told that out of jealousy Yannai brought about the death of his pupil. As to the poem itself, Zunz pointed out that it was written in

² בכ"ו"הע, 1829, 111.

³ Cf. **הרי ר' ינאי שהיה מן החכמים**, ed. Buber, 25: **הראשונים ופייט קרובות לכל סדר וסדר שלכל השנה**. This responsum was also published by Landshuth (**עמודי העבודה**, 102) from a MS. **מעשה הגאונים** by Zedekiah Anaw, which he says was bought by the Bodleian library in 1854, but no mention of it is to be found in Neubauer's Catalogue. Prof. Marx found in the covers of an old book two MS. leaves, one of which contains the above responsum, but is no part of the **שבלי הלכת**, as the remaining passages show. It has also the important variant **וגם ר' לכל הרגלים** instead of **קלונימום שמענו שחכם גדול היה ופייט קרובות של פסח**. Perhaps this leaf is a part of the **מעשה הגאונים**.

⁴ **כרם חמד**, VI (1841), 25.

⁵ Rapoport does not say which, but perhaps it is codex München 69. See Zunz, *Litg.*, 28, note 4.

⁶ The same who is responsible for the legend about R. Amnon, the author of **ונתנה תוקף** (כ"ח, *ibid*).

rime and had the Alphabet and the name יניי in acrostic.⁷ Later it was asserted by Luzzatto that the poem אן רוב נסים הפלאת which is found in the same part of the prayers was likewise the composition of Yannai.⁸

Although Rapoport clung to his theory that both Yannai and Kalir lived in Italy, yet his critical sense detected the influence of Palestine in the way Yannai spelled his name in the acrostic.⁹ But it is the general opinion of scholars now, that Yannai was a Palestinian and that he flourished not later than the second half of the seventh century.¹⁰ This latter assertion finds its support in the fact brought out by Harkavy, that in two places Kirkisani says of Anan, the founder of the Karaite sect, that he used the liturgical compositions of Yannai (חזאנה ינאי).¹¹ In this connection it may also be said, that Yannai was mentioned by Jehudi ben Sheshet, a pupil of Dunash ben Labrat, as Dukes pointed out.¹² Mention of Yannai is also found in Saadya's

⁷ מחזור כמנהג אשכנזים, *ibid.*; *Litg.*, 28. This poem is found in Cremona 1561; Venice 1600; Vienna 1823 and in סדר שער השמים of Isaiah Hurwitz, Amsterdam 1717.

⁸ סילוק, *ibid.*; *Litg.*, 28. His reason is that the or completing stanza of the poem אונני פטרי רחמים, which begins with the words לילה לבנה כי אין לפניך לילה fits in well with the refrain יהי ברחמי הלילה. But this is hardly any proof, as any one else could have done the same. Rapoport, however, is of the same opinion (המגיד, 1863, 23). S. A. Wertheimer in גנוזי ירושלים (Jerusalem 1901), 18 b, 19 a published two poems of Yannai: שיר השירים אשרה נא לירידי for the seventh day of Passover from an Oxford MS. (see Neubauer, Cat. II, 2708 r) and תענו אן בפתרום for the second Sabbath before the ninth of Ab (see Brody in *Jewish Encyc.*, XII, 586); see also Graetz, *Die Anfänge der neuhebräischen Poesie* (MGWJ., VIII, 401 and IX, 19, 57).

⁹ That is ינני, not ינאי. Cf. כ"ה, VI, 26.

¹⁰ Cf. Harkavy, *Studien und Mittheilungen* V, 106. Brody, *l. c.*, puts him as early as the first half of the seventh century.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 107-108.

¹² נחל קדומים, Hannover 1853, 2. See also S. G. Stern, תשובות יהודי, ל"ק, 158, אבן ששת, 37, line 12, and cf. Pinsker, 158.

ספר האגרון,¹³ and in No. LI of Prof. Schechter's *Saadyana*, which is a fragment of an old work on the art of poetry, the writings of the "well known-Yannai" (ינאי אלמערון) are cited as examples of rimed prose.¹⁴

The fragment given below¹⁵ proves beyond a doubt that there did exist at one time a collection of Yannai's liturgical compositions (מחזור ינאי) and that it was so well known that the mere mention of the first lines was all that was necessary for the scribe to give. Our fragment has three such lines: או בהקרא באוני עניו מות; אם לך שלטון בכל חי and אסומה פתוחה ממקור חכמות. It also has a longer quotation from the Mahzor, designated as רהט, which is complete as far as it goes, but the concluding words seem to indicate that it is only a part of a larger composition.

What the original character of our MS. was is difficult to say, but the three pages that have been preserved consist of five sections, each section consisting of the להן, or melody, the poem which is to be recited with that particular *lahn*, and a פומון, or refrain. Of the first section, however, we have only the refrain, as the *lahn* was mentioned in the preceding page, now lost, and the poem itself is also not recorded. The second section says that "the congregation itself shall then say two verses again with the *lahn* אום משובה" and the פומון אלי אלי.¹⁶ But the name of the poem from which these verses are to be

¹³ Harkavy, *l. c.*, 50.

¹⁴ Cf. Bacher's translation of this fragment in *JQR.*, XIV, 743; חזאנה ינאי also occurs in a Genizah fragment published by Poznański (*JQR.*, XV, 77, No. 12).

¹⁵ T-S. LOAN, 165, 2 leaves paper, 13 x 10 cm. square writing approaching cursive style. The last page is blank. There are several corrections in the text made by the scribe himself, but these are not reproduced here as they are of no importance.

¹⁶ Cf. below Fol. 1, *recto*, line 5-6.

taken is not stated. It must have been mentioned before. The last section, again, has also the רהט in addition to the *lahn*, the poem and the refrain. If the pieces designated as פומון are not merely refrains but the beginnings of larger poems, then we may say that our fragment has preserved for us the beginnings of thirteen liturgical pieces, four of which at least are those of Yannai.¹⁷ The whole fragment seems to deal with the life and death of Moses. It is therefore not unlikely that we have here a part of the liturgy for the day of the Rejoicing of the Law.

(Fol. I recto)

[§ 1] ...מנ. ביתין באל לחן אל מרכור
ויקאל עליה פומ' שפך סיחו¹⁸ ללוקח
רוחו וצורו הבטירו * בטובת פענוח[ו]¹⁹
ובן מאה ועשרים כהלך לנו זו לא כהתה
עיניו ולא נם לחה²⁰: תם²¹ יקאל מן אל ארפה²²
[§ 2] בעינהא ביתין איצא בלחן אמר המן

¹⁷ They are as follows: 1) שפך סיחו [שיחו] ללוקח רוחו

2) אלי אלי שמעה בקולי 3) אמר המן לאבר

4) אם לך שלטון בכל חי 5) את לבב עמי מה תשבר

6) אז בהקרא באזני עניו 8) את בני בכרי 7) יקר בעיני יי

9) אסומה פתוחה 11) מתי תפסח 10) ומי רועה כמותי

12) יחי ראובן ובתים ייבן 13) אב להכמים בבואו למות

¹⁸ Read שיחו.

¹⁹ The rime requires the correction; on the use of this word see Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, 429-430.

²⁰ Deut. 34, 7. The characteristic of this Pizmon as well as of those that follow is that they conclude with a verse from the Bible. The scribe indicated the quotation by putting two points in an oblique way over one or more of the words of the quotation. Here, then, is an early form of quotation marks.

²¹ = *thumma*.

²² *mina-l-ulfati* = "by the congregation". See Lane, I, 80 c.

²³ There is nothing missing here, but the scribe crossed out something which he started to write.

לאבד אום משובה²⁴ ומפזמן
 אלי אלי שמעה בקולי · ועם גורלי
 אעבור ברגלי · לחלקי וחבלי · ושמחת
 גילי · ראה עניי ועמלי²⁵ · אלהים יי חילי:
 [§ 3] אחר לחן את לבב עמי מה תשבר ·
 אם לך שלטון בכל חי וכול במחזור ינאי²⁶
 פזמ' יקר בעיני יי המותה לחסידיו²⁶
 (Fol. I, verso)

[§ 4] אחר לחן את בני בכרי ·
 אז בהקרא באזני עניי²⁷ מות²⁸ · וכול במחזור ינאי²⁹
 פזמ' ומי רועה כמותי · לנהג עדתי · ומי
 יספר נחמתי · על חלקי ונחלתי · אשביעד
 משרתי³⁰ · בלוקח נשמתי · שמור מרעיתי
 אחרי מותי · ואולם אני אדרוש לאל
 ואל אלהים אשים דברתי³¹ ·
 [§ 5] אחר לחן מתי תפסח³¹ ·
 אסומה³² פתוחה ממקור חכמות וכול
 במחזור ינאי ו"ל · פזמ' · אב לחכמים³³
 בבואו למות · איזן מרומות ושימע
 הדומות³⁴ · וברך שבטים ופינ³⁵ בנאימות
 יחי ראובן ואל ימות³⁶ · רהט³⁷ יחי ראובן
 ובתים ייבן · וישקט שמעון במקדש

²⁴ Jerem. 3, 6.

²⁵ Joel 3, 19.

²⁶ Ps. 116, 15.

²⁷ Num. 12, 3.

²⁸ Read מות.

²⁹ Num. 11, 28.

³⁰ Job 5, 8.

³¹ This is perhaps to be read מתי תפסח, cf. II Kings 15, 16.

³² For a similar use of the root אסם see Zunz, *Lit.*, 148, No. 7.

³³ Cf. משה חכם גדול אב החכמים ואב הנביאים, ed. Friedman, 50 b, ספרי; also חמשים שערי בינה נבראו בעולם וכולם נתנו למשה חסר אחד 21 b: ראש השנה

³⁴ Cf. Isa. 66, 1: הארץ הרם רגלי and Deut. 32, 1.

³⁵ On the use of this word see Zunz, *Synag. Poesie*, 380.

³⁶ Deut. 33, 6.

³⁷ See Zunz, *l. c.*, 79; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, § 18 at the end.

(Fol. 2 recto)

ומעון³⁸ · סגן לוי · יכהן בנוי · פרחי יהודה
 פציהו בתודה · חנימי³⁹ יששכר · יקחו טוב
 שכר · זרע זבולון · זכות יונחלון · נער דן ·
 טובות יתעדן · ילדי נפתלי · שבע רצון
 אלי · זקני גר · אִילָנָם יומגד⁴⁰ · כתות
 אשר · יצליחו בכושר · המון יוסף
 צרים ישסף · שבט בנימין יפרוץ
 שמאל וימין · שבטים שנים עשר
 ברכתם תומסר · ויעמוד כמוסר
 מיבאל השר⁴¹ : ונערי... אלהינו
 אל אלהים חיוק אותו · וכול במחזור ינאי

³⁸ Ps. 26, 8.³⁹ פרחי = mature men, a term borrowed from agriculture just as חנימי.
 Cf. ראש השנה 15 b: אילן שהנמו פירותיו.⁴⁰ Deut. 33, 13.⁴¹ Cf. Dan. 12, 1. The meaning is perhaps that Michael the tutelary
 angel of Israel will oppose Samael the denunciator [read במוסר] of Israel.
 Cf. Gen. R., c. 21.

A PAPAL BRIEF OF PIUS IV

BY MAX RADIN, Newton High School, New York City

ON examining the parchment cover of a copy of a ritual (Tikkun) for the community of Casale, printed at Venice, 1626, and belonging to the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (cf. Van Straalen, *Cat. of the Heb. Books in the British Museum*, 1894, p. 143, col. 2), it was found that the inner portion contained a document of the character of which there could be little doubt.

The piece of parchment is a fragment of a larger piece which must have been about fourteen inches wide. Before cut to fit the book of which it was made the cover, it had been folded in the middle, so that of the left hand portion considerably more than half is missing and of the right hand somewhat less than half. That is to say, we shall have to understand between every line nearly another full line.

Fortunately, however, it is a public document and, therefore, largely formulaic in character. In spite of the serious gap to be filled in reading it, we can make out the substance fairly well. It is an official transcript of a papal brief or *breve*, which the prothonotary Augustine of Cusa made at Rome in 1587-1588.

The text is as follows:

In Nomine Sanctissimae et Individuae Trinitatis.

1.—*Augustinus Cusanus Prothonotarius* Aplicus, S. D. N.

Papae necnon Curiae causarum Camerae aplicae —

- 2.—extra eam latorum ac litarum aplicarum quarumcumq.
universalis et moerus *exequutor* —
- 3.—que pns publicum Transumpti Instum visuris lecturis
et audituris salutem in Domino —
- 4.—ut de his quae de Romani pontificis gratia processerunt
ac in nro Tribunali coram —
- 5.—uta ac registrata reperiuntur cum expedit aut ab ali-
quibus petitur veritati Testimoni —
6. *Augustinus Cusanus Auditor et Judex prefatus tenu-*
imus et legimus et —
- 7.—sub die nona mensis Decembris 1563, apud Acta
infrascripti nostri notarii ex —
- 8.—non cancellatum non vitiatum nec in aliqua sui parte
suspectum sed omni prorsus —
- 9.—ad futuram rei memoriam. Dudum accepto quod licet
certum hebreorum volumen —
- 10.—Republica christiana Inquisitoribus gnalibus de man-
dato nostro damnatum et —
- 11.—Redemptorem nostrum eiusq. sanctissimum nomen et
honorem blasfemias et ignominias continens —
- 12.—hebreorum infra limites iurisdictionis suae consis-
tentibus ex parte nostra intimarent et —
- 13.—quibus nomen Jesu Salvatoris nostri quod hebraice
Jesui hanozri dicitur cum blasphemia aut —
- 14.—diligentissime exquirerentur et qui libros hmoī penes
se quoquo modo habere reperti forent de —
- 15.—corporalibus etiam ultimi suppliciq. ac alias prout a
fide christi appostantes —
- 16.—habere hmoī omni diligentia inquirerent et studiose
investigarent inquiriq. et investigari
- 17.——ibili punirent, non permittentes de cetero
eosdem hebreos a quibusvis etiam apl —

- 18.—continerent nisi de exp^{re}ss^o ^{nro} mandato quomodo libet vexari aut molestari. Cum aut —
- 19.—*Salvatoris* nostri cum blasphemia aut ignominiose nominabatur cassa deleta abolita seu abrasa —
- 20.—reperiantur illi penes quos tales libri reperti fuerint tamquam habentes libros in quibus —
- 21.—dubitandi materi^am amputare volentes. Motu proprio et ex certa scientia ^{nra} per ^{pns} —
- 22.—contra Christum Redemptorem ^{nrum} eiusq. sanctissimum nomen et honorem blasphemia —
- 23.—cassis deletis abolitis et abrasis ut nullatenus legi possint libros eosdem ita expurgatos et —
- 24.—et locis publicis quam privatis domibus et alias ubiq. locorum habere et tenere absque aliquarum poenarum
- 25.—nominaretur. Ipsiq. Hebrei illos tum tenuerint et haberint dummodo intra dies quattuor, menses —
- 26.— — cumque Iudices et Commisarios quavis auctoritate fungentes etiam Causarum Palatii Auditores in quavis —
- 27.—et diffiniri debere ac si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter
- 28.—ariis quibuscumque. Datum Romae apud ^{stum} Petrum sub Anulo Piscatoris Die vigesima octava Decembris —
29. Quarum quidem ^{Trarum} ^{aplicarum} sumptum ad instantiam et requisitionem
- 30.—et exemplari ac in hanc publici Transumpti formam redigi mandavimus et fecimus volentes et —
- 31.—adhibeatur eque ac si litterae ipsae originales in medium exhibitae aut ostensae forent. In *Quorum*

- 32.—quo in talibus utimur iussimus et fecimus appensione
muniri. Dat. Romae in Aedibus $\overline{\text{nr̄is}}$ sub Ap —
33.—Sexti Papae Quinti Anno Tertio. $\overline{\text{Pntibus}}$ ibidem DD.

Scipione Grimaldo et Marco Antonio Bruto

The exordium recites the formulaic section found in most papal bulls and briefs, authorizing the issuance of transcripts, *cum expedit aut ab aliquibus petitur*, "when it is deemed expedient or is required by any person or persons." Lines 1-5. (Cf. the section *Ceterum quia difficile foret* in the brief of Pius IV, Feb. 27, 1562.)

The prothonotary, auditor and iudex—he boasts of all these titles—finds in his office a decree which he has himself held, examined and read, and which contains no mark of erasure or cancellation (lines 6-9). This refers to the practice in the Papal registry, of marking documents no longer valid with the words *Cancellatum*, etc., in whole or in part.

Then follows (lines 9-28) a copy in full of the papal letter or brief.

Of this decree, the document before us is declared to be a true copy, and it is ordered, in accordance with the clause *Ceterum quia difficile*, mentioned above, that the same force and effect be granted to it as would be granted to the original. It is then dated in the third year of Sixtus V and witnessed by Scipio Grimaldi and Marcantonio Bruto.

Who the persons are at whose instance and request (l. 29, *sumptum ad instantiam et requisitionem*) this copy was issued, unfortunately does not appear.

But it is, of course, the papal letter or brief itself which chiefly attracts our attention.

In substance it runs as follows:

Although a certain book or certain books (*certum hebreorum volumen*, l. 9; *libri huiusmodi*, l. 14) of the Jews have been condemned as blasphemous by the Grand Inquisitor, and though those who, upon search, are found to possess them are subject to the same penalties as for apostacy, the various officials whose duty to investigate and search for such books is here re-emphasized, are not to permit general and unauthorized molestation of the Jews, inasmuch as, if all scandalous or blasphemous references to Jesus or to Christianity shall have been obliterated, it is expressly ordered that these books may be freely kept and used anywhere, either in public or private, provided, of course, that the books have been submitted to inspection.

The bill is then dated December 28th, but the year is tantalizingly absent.

Who is the pope who issues it and what relation has this decree to the many similar utterances of pope and council?

Two dates are given, one of the transcript, viz., the third year of Sixtus V, or 1587-1588, and one other mentioned in the body of the document, Dec. 9, 1563 (l. 7), which falls within the reign of Pius IV.

We shall, however, look in vain either in special or general collections of papal documents for the decree before us. The fullest of these, the *Magnum Bullarium Romanum*, put together from the archives by Tomassetti in 1867 under the auspices of Pius IX and published at Turin, contains an especially large number of documents of both the popes mentioned above, but not this brief. Nor again is it to be found in Stern's *Urkundliche Beiträge*, nor in the numerous discussions either of the period or of the sub-

ject. We may, therefore, assume that it is a new and unpublished document of which we must determine the relation and effect.

The agitation against the Talmud, fostered chiefly by apostates, was already of long duration by the beginning of the sixteenth century, and culminated finally in the public burning of the book and in its prohibition. But on March 24, 1564, a *breve* was issued confirming the Tridentine Index. Pius IV, for reasons, perhaps not the most creditable (cf. Graetz, IX, 3rd ed., Breslau, 1891, p. 368, note), permitted the printing of the Talmud without that title and after expurgation.

This qualified tolerance had been rendered nugatory by the severe repressive measures of Pius IV's successors. In 1586, just as some twenty years before had been done under Pius IV, a deputation waited on Sixtus V and pleaded for permission to print and possess copies of the Talmud. Sixtus, in his decree of October 22, 1586, gave the permission sought for with the usual stipulation of preliminary censoring.

If the dates mentioned (cf. Graetz, IX, 368, and 470, and *Bullarium Magnum*, 7, p. 167, and 8, p. 789,) are considered, it is evident from the date of the decree here transcribed, December 28 (l. 28), that it is identical with neither of the two just referred to. Both position and phrasing (*sub anulo Piscatoris*, *ibid.*) make it impossible to refer the date, December 28, in this document, to anything else than the Papal brief itself.

As it stands, it would not be impossible to connect it with the document of 1586. For, although in the article by Deutsch, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, X, 127 a, it would seem that the bull was wholly devoted to the subject of censor-

ship, and Graetz, IX, 470, seems to confirm that statement, the bull itself as it appears in the *Bullarium Magnum* (supra) and, indeed, as Graetz himself states (IX, 468), was in reality a general grant of privileges and refers to the specific matter of printing only by implication.* This document, if it were shortly before the transcript in time would in a measure complete the bull of 1586.

Two things, however, make it impossible to place it in this period. First, the true copy here issued is expressly stated to have been of a document found recorded and registered in the office (*apud acta infrascripti notarii*, l. 7) and not in any way cancelled or suspicious. This does not point to a recently issued decree.

Secondly, and most important of all, no restoration of missing words between lines 6 and 7 can escape the inference that the document so registered bore the date (of registration) December 9, 1563.

Since the Papal brief is dated December 28, it follows that the omitted year cannot be later than 1562.

It is obvious that if, in 1586, a bull or other decree had been issued permitting the printing of Hebrew books, no one, in 1587, would think of falling back upon a document of 1562 or earlier. The statement, then, so frequently made that the bull of 1586 did that very thing, viz.: lifted the prohibition of the Talmud and other Hebrew books, is based upon a misapprehension of the effect of that decree.

* Graetz found the bull only in Coqueline's *Collectio*, IV, 4, No. 69. The above-mentioned *Bullarium*, however, contains it, in its regular chronological place.—The term "bull" has been used for this decree, in accordance with the statements of the various writers who have discussed it. Strictly, however, it is no more a bull than the document here published. Both are signed *sub anulo Piscatoris* and are therefore briefs. Bulls are sealed with the *bullæ*. The distinction, to be sure, had ceased to be of serious moment in the latter half of the sixteenth century.

As before stated, the decree was of the most general character and meant for the widest publicity. The technical portions, i. e. exordium and conclusion, are in Latin, the main body, however, is in Italian. Not only that, it is intended to abrogate (subject to the etiquette necessary to a system in which direct abrogation is impossible), the restrictions successively imposed on the Jews by Pius V and those after him. It consciously restores, therefore, the conditions obtaining under Pius IV. Naturally, Jews, who desired protection in their rights, would supply themselves with copies of those documents of Pius IV, to which, we may say, the bull of October 22, 1586, had given a renewed validity.

But the bull of February 27, 1562, mentioned above (incorrectly dated 1555 and referred to Paul IV, *Jewish Encyc.*, X, 129), was also of general indulgence and makes no mention of books or censorship. Again, it was not until 1563, after the brief here transcribed, that the deputation of Italian Jews visited Pius IV, to obtain permission to print the Talmud.

But is it the Talmud, after all, which is here permitted? The phrase "*certum hebreorum volumen*" occurs in line 9. It is easily possible that the actual word *Talmud* was found in the missing portions. All this is in the earlier portion of the decree. Later on, when the expurgated books are mentioned, it is *tales libri, libri huiusmodi*, etc. Again in the earlier portion, special attention is given to the name *Jesui hanozri* (l. 13), which is stated to be the Hebrew equivalent for the name of Jesus. This would also point to the Talmud, or to the Toledot Yeshu.

If we were then to understand the decree before us as stating that, while it had long been decided to forbid

certum hebreorum volumen, viz.: the Talmud, other Hebrew books, if properly expurgated, were free, we have an intelligible version of a document which, otherwise, would have rendered the Tridentine Index and the bull embodying it unnecessary. That non-Talmudic books were, even after the decree of 1559, allowed, though reluctantly, we know (cf. Porges, *Jewish Enc.*, III, 648 a). Just as at Cremona, in the incident there recorded, so at Rome on appeal to a well-disposed Pope like Pius IV, over-zealous inquisitors may have been warned that the decree of 1559 included only the Talmud and not all Hebrew books.

A point deserving attention, and fixing probably the date of this brief at 1562, is that the opening words "dudum accepto" are an echo of the opening words of the bull of February 27, 1562, "*Dudum a felicis recordationis Paulo*, etc.". To be sure, the cases might be reversed and the latter document might be an echo of the former. Still from the vastly more important character of the decree of February 27, this hypothesis seems less probable.

PROFESSOR SMITH'S "JERUSALEM"

Jerusalem—The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to A. D. 70. With Maps and Illustrations. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D. D., LL. D. London: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 1907-1908. Two Volumes (pp. xx, 498; xvi, 681; 8°).

PROFESSOR Smith has chosen a great subject, and he has handled it brilliantly, with a glow that is lit up from the glory of Zion. The perennial and increasing interest of the theme appears from the almost contemporaneous publication of three other books on Jerusalem by Dr. Merrill, Colonel Conder, and Professor Paton. There is no necessity of rivalry in this field; it is large enough for all trained and conscientious workers. Dr. Smith has had the inspiration of plotting out an undertaking which has not been before attempted. He would give an interpretation of Jerusalem on the basis of all that is known about her, both from the *débris* of archæology and the scattered references of literature. But the accumulation of facts, arduous and complete as that labor has been, is but the fundament of the work; the genius of the author reveals itself in the revivification of Jerusalem, so that her people walk her streets for us, we see what they saw, and we follow the clues of their common, everyday life, withal that the subject is not reduced to the sordid level of secularism, but always we feel the pulse of that inner, inscrutable life which has made her a spiritual mistress of the three religions of the West.

A professor of zoology has recently insisted on the fact that the poetic or artistic instinct is the nerve of all physical science; the same is true, still more imperative, of history, for the reason that the subject-matter of human history is itself poetic, the life of humanity. And George Adam Smith possesses the genius to interpret this sentient and creative spirit of human life, even when revealed in the broken fragments of ancient history. We speak of

this characteristic first, because it is the greatest. Yet, if it stood alone, the result might be only a fair ideal construction, appealing to the sense of the æsthetic but without response to the historical demand for facts. But the charm and proof of Professor Smith's genius lies in his ability to maintain and expound the poetic spell while he delves into the dust and bones of antiquity. To take the text of his book, he ignores not one of the things seen, which are temporal, they are for him the figures of the true; but as the Christian *midrash* concerning Abraham expresses it (Hebrews 11), he always "looks for the city which hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God", that ideal of priest and prophet, of Jesus and of Akiba, which has been the constituent element in Jerusalem's history.

There is perfect balance between the poetic and the analytic features of the work. As one admires the former, he recognizes that the author has not shunned a single objective task which has lain in his way. For him interpretation does not mean the overruling of facts but the accounting for them. Hence the division of his subject is based on secular lines. The work, which appears in two handsome and beautifully executed volumes, containing over eleven hundred pages, is divided into three books. Following a noble Introduction on "The Essential City", which compounds the realism and the idealism of the subject, the respective books treat "The Topography—Sites and Names"; "The Economics and Politics;" "The History," which latter comprises the whole second volume. The author thus engages all the vexed problems of philology, archæology, criticism, and historical reconstruction. First should be noticed the reasonableness and gentleness of all his discussions. No subject has been more fruitful of acrimony than the Holy City, whether in the contentions of hostile religions or prejudiced archæologists. Dr. Smith is a devout Christian and a sturdy Protestant, but he never abuses Jewish or ecclesiastical prejudices and traditions. Where he can speak on his own authority, he does so lucidly and at length, but without expatiation; he is fair and full in his treatment of opposite opinions. And he is equally modest in admitting his lack of special skill, but in these cases the opinion he lets fall commends itself by its conviction and reasonableness.

Two large volumes on a confined subject might appear too much; but though ample treatment is given to all problems, there is no waste of discussion and show of *akribeia*. This quality appears particularly in the first book, which treats of the topography. It will be an admirable guide to both layman and scholar in the mazes of the city's geography, and it will prove attractive and illuminating in a subject which in itself is dry and necessarily somewhat incomprehensible to a student who has not seen the contour and walls of Jerusalem. The chapters are written with the reader as well as the subject in mind; the writer feels it his duty to make the former visualize the latter. He has no new opinions to advance on the topography. In general he agrees with the consensus of modern scholarship, whose opinions, it is to be remembered, he has been a party in forming. Zion, David's City, the Ophel, are the same, the southern projection of the eastern hill; he doubts whether the southwestern hill was included at all in the earlier city, but holds that this must have been effected by Hezekiah's time, at least for the protection of the pool of Siloam. The question of the northern walls is fully treated. A series of admirable colored topographical maps throughout the volumes presents the various stages of the city's growth through the centuries, as the author understands the development.

The second book which treats of the economics of the city, presents a wider and more novel theme. The value of this section is not confined merely to the subject; every Palestinian city comes under its scope, and we have for the first time a treatment of "The Ancient City" for the Biblical world, based upon the community for which after all we possess more materials than any other in that sphere. Even Babylonian archæology has not brought us much beyond the confines of temple and palace. Then there is the particular problem of Jerusalem, which possessed none of the commercial and agricultural resources of a metropolis; by nature only an 'Ir or akropolis, she grew into a great city as the artificial creation of royalty and religion. Hence its politics differed from that of the other cities of Israel, except Samaria, of which we know almost nothing; its direct government lay theoretically in the hands of the king or the highpriest. But again, in the action and

reaction of social life, a new element arose. Jerusalem grew into a cosmopolitan city, with its mercenaries and traders, its pilgrims and foreign rulers. It became a city in the most intense sense of the word, as London is to England or Paris to France, with a clamorous, aggressive citizenry, insistent on its voice and action, by force or obstinacy or purchase acquiring its privileges from the *de facto* ruler, king or highpriest. In a striking chapter on "The Multitude" Professor Smith admirably brings this point out; he shows, what is often ignored, how the people of Jerusalem were by no means the complaisant subjects of court and temple, but often successfully opposed the royal or priestly policy; more than once too the dominant faction was successfully antagonistic to the spiritual interests connected with the Temple. Without doubt the people of Jerusalem exercised a constitutional part in the conduct of Judah's affairs, whatever position we may take upon the definition of Sanhedrin and Great Synagogue. The author opposes, it may be remarked, Büchler's theory of the existence of two distinct religious and civil tribunals in Jerusalem. It would be interesting to know what position he would take toward Judge Sulzberger's interpretation of the Am Ha-Aretz. But he fully appreciates the democratic character of the Jewish constitution; he will not admit that the constitution of the free Greek cities materially affected that of Jerusalem, which was essentially indigenous. True and profound is the comparison which he draws (II, p. 439) between the Areopagus and the Temple courts. In this connection it may be suggested that a comparative study of what the Greeks called "holy cities", to which class Jerusalem belonged, would be most instructive; the cities so recognized by Hellenistic politics were mostly on Semitic or kindred soil.

The third book, on the history of Jerusalem, is a shaft dropped right through the centuries of Israel's history, at its very core. At least from the time of Isaiah Jerusalem is the centre of Israel, and her history is that of the race. The second volume is accordingly a limited history of the Jewish people, and we would express the hope that Professor Smith will now undertake the task of that desideratum in English Biblical literature, a history of Israel. Withal, despite this expansion of his subject, he keeps his purpose well in

view; it is still the story of Jerusalem he tells, as acted and seen by Jerusalemites, with ever the Holy City for the setting. The *abondance de richesse* in this volume hinders from further analysis; we are content to take it as the prolegomena of a larger work.

To notice now some particular points, we would call attention to the full and often original discussions of the place-names in and around Jerusalem. For En-Rogel Smith rejects the interpretation "Fuller's Spring", very properly, and connects the doubtful word with the Syriac *rōgūlō* (*rāgōlā*) "current," supposing that the ancient spring which gave its name to what is now irregularly called a spring has disappeared through seismic action. A better verbal connection would be with the cognate Syriac word *r'gel'thā*, the Arabic *riḡlah*, which means both stream and wady, the former being a standing Peshitto translation of the Hebrew *nahal*. The participial form in *rōgel* may be compared to the Syriac noun-of-agent *rāgōlā* (which also equals *nahal*) and to the participial form of the Arabic *wādy*. En-Rogel is then "the spring (at the head) of the wady", *i. e.* the Wady en-Nar. To the modern name for this spring, Bir Ayyub, "Job's Well", might be cited Kittel's suggestion that the name is a reminiscence of Joab and the history in I Kings 1. For the name Sion an attractive etymology is offered (I, p. 145): it is the same as a frequent Arabic place-name for a citadel, Ṣahyun, to be derived from *ṣahweh* "hmup, ridge". The philological contraction into Sion would agree with Lagarde's preference for the Syriac Ṣehyon as original. It seems to us that the Hebrew *ṣiyyūn*, a cairn for marking the road, etc., is the simplest etymology. An elaborate discussion of the name Jerusalem is given, in which is combatted Haupt's Sumerian etymology, without arrival at a positive conclusion. The explanation just published by Clay which makes the first element the god Ur now relieves the difficulty. As for the post-Hebraic forms, Hierousalem, etc. (see I, p. 261 ff), we think that the first three syllables must have been an artificial expansion to introduce the idea of *leḥōs*. On the subject of the *ṣinnōr*, II Sam. 5, 8 (p. 106), Vincent's article on the Gezer Tunnel (*PEF. Qu. St.*, 1908, p. 218) can now be added to the discussion. The epigraphic evidence for the early date of the Siloam inscription (p. 102) is again seriously questioned by Stanley

A: Cook in the *Quarterly Statement* for October. As for the archæological problems connected with "the conduit of the upper pool towards the highway of the fuller's field", II Kings 18, 17; Isa. 7, 3, may they be relieved by the, to be sure, drastic theory that in consequence of the similarity of episodes the geographical details in Isaiah have been inserted into the passage in Kings? This theory would meet the strategic objection of General Wilson that the parley with the Assyrians could not have been held at the eastern wall.

Professor Smith shows his ability as an interpreter in many apt translations; thus *mishpat* he renders "cultus" (p. 387), and *mō'ed* as "diet" (p. 390). On the next page his references to the Hebrew of Ben Sira, note 5, are not borne out by Smend's readings. As an archæological note for the introduction of the Iron Age in Palestine (p. 331) may be cited I Sam. 13, 19 ff., which is evidence for the scarcity of ironsmiths at that epoch; we may suppose that these rare artisans were Philistine "tinkers" whom the Philistine over-lords were able to recall from Israel's land. The story of David and Goliath would then be a reminiscence of the borderland between the two Ages. II Sam. 14, 26 is not proof, despite p. 329, that "David stamped shekels, presumably of silver". But that there was some form of recognized small silver money, whether stamped or not, from early times, appears not only from the Biblical use of the plural of *kesef* but also from the use of *zu-zu* in the Amarna tablets as the denomination below the mana. Later, in the Aramaic, *zūz* is the name for the coin representing the shekel-weight of silver, and this appears to be practically its meaning at that early period. (See Bezold, *Oriental Diplomacy*, no. 4, etc. Bezold is correct in recognizing the zuz over against Winckler and Knudtzon, who translate "shekel").

Dr. Smith takes an antagonistic position to the claim of a specific Hittite factor in Jerusalem (II, p. 14 ff.). But Winckler has now been able to show, in his report on his excavations at Boghazkoi, published Dec., 1907, that Khiba, which appears in the name of the Jerusalemite governor in the Tell el-Amarna tablets, is a Hittite deity; also the Hittite Kharri may possibly be connected with the Canaanite Horites. As for the name of Araunah, the possessor of

the Temple site, a recent discovery, about to be announced, makes it reasonable to hold that his name is Indo-European. To p. 95, it may be noted that Budde in his recent *History of Hebrew Literature* would date the Yahwist as early as Solomon's reign.

A few misprints have been observed: I, p. 102, note 1, read *II Kings*; p. 108, note 2, last line, a *waw* for a *nun*; II, p. 97, l. 18, read "first" for "second". By a queer lapse the points of the compass are thrice reversed: I, p. 93, l. 26 and p. 93, l. 19, read "west" for "east"; p. 130, l. 3, read "south-east" for "south-west". Extensive indices conclude each volume; it would be convenient if in a new edition they might be united at the end of the second.

Philadelphia Divinity School

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

JUDAISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE evil that men write, as well as the evil that men do, often lives after them. Calumnies against the Jews seem to have a peculiarly charmed life: in classical times Manetho, an Egyptian historian of the third century B. C. E., represented that they were in origin a pack of Egyptian lepers who were expelled from his country because of their foul disease. The story was refuted over and over again; yet Tacitus writing in the second century C. E. solemnly repeats it with a little decoration. In parts of the New Testament, again, the Pharisees are represented by their enemies as a class of self-righteous hypocrites. Historical criticism has proved that the charges come from embittered controversialists; yet writer after writer repeats them as though they were certain truths, and pays no account to their refutation and the fuller knowledge which is now available.

The latest repetition of the story occurs in "The Conflict of Religions in the Roman Empire", by Mr. Glover, a classical lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge, whose book has attracted a considerable amount of attention in England. It is one of the 'Life and Time Histories' as they have been called; but it differs from many of the class in that the author is not a pure theologian, but has a large knowledge of the Greek and Roman literature of the first three centuries of the Christian era. It does not claim to be a work of erudite scholarship, but a popular representation of the religious conditions in which Christianity grew up, based on a series of lectures which were given at a Theological College. It may be considered then to embody the current conception of Judaism which is disseminated among theological students, and it is therefore worth while to dissect its statements in some detail; for the involuntary anti-Judaism of scholars is as dangerous as the deliberate anti-Semitism of politicians. Mr. Glover has endeavored, as he puts it in his preface, "to see the founder of the Christian

movement and some of his followers as they appeared among their contemporaries, to represent Christian and Pagan with equal goodwill and equal honesty and in my perspective to recapture something of the colour and movement of life, using imagination to interpret the data, and controlling it by them."

It is perhaps accidental that Mr. Glover omits the Jews among those he intends "to represent with equal goodwill and equal honesty;" but it cannot be accidental that in his list of authorities there is not a single book by a Jew, nor a single standard work written from the Jewish point of view. Paul is after all not the only reliable authority for the Judaism of the period. The Talmud is doubtless a difficult book for the Gentile to study, and the elaborate works upon it by German scholars may not be attractive: Mr. Glover might, however, with less difficulty have consulted the writings of two members of his own University, the Edition of the Sayings of the Fathers by the late Master of St. John's College, and Professor Schechter's articles upon Jewish Theology; and had he done so, he must have regarded the Jews with a little more truth and a better perspective. As it is we have a rehash of the old denunciations of Pharisaism and its mechanical soulless conception of religion, which poses for an account of Judaism at the time. It is surely a little grotesque that an author who has made a close study of the Stoics, Plutarch, Justin, Celsus, Apuleius, in fact of every pagan scribbler who has survived from that epoch, in order to get a true setting for early Christianity, should know nothing of contemporary Judaism at first hand; and so long as theologians and theological historians are unable or unwilling to go to the Rabbis themselves, and accept the Pauline epistles and Schürer's history equally as gospel truth, so long will they give an account of the Jews which is not history but '*Tendenz-writing*'.

Having given an illuminating survey of Roman religion, the Stoic religious philosophy, and Plutarch's religious eclecticism, Mr. Glover in his fourth chapter comes to the central figure of his book, Jesus of Nazareth, and treats him in the manner of Renan: i. e. he puts aside what is miraculous in the Gospel narrative, accepts the rest as true, and heightens its effect with some local color and rhetorical writing. With this we have no special cavil, though it may be remarked that the rejection of the miraculous elements in

the life of Jesus makes it more unreasonable to regard him as absolutely unique among his contemporaries. All experience teaches us that the great men of any age reflect in their highest development the ideas of that age; and it is, therefore, unscientific of Mr. Glover to assume that the humanity and spirituality of Jesus are in contrast with the attitude of the Rabbis.

But what we are specially concerned with is not Mr. Glover's account of Jesus but his attitude to contemporary Judaism, and in order to appreciate his outlook and method it is necessary to quote a somewhat long passage. He is dealing with the teaching of Jesus upon man's relation to God. "Jews and Greeks," he says, at this period "talked of righteousness and holiness—'holy' is one of the great words of the period—and they sought these things in ritual and abstinence. Modern Jews resent the suggestion that the thousand and one regulations as to ceremonial purity, and the casuistries, as many or more, spun out of the law and the traditions, ranked with the great commandments of neighbourly love and the worship of the One God. No doubt they are right, but it is noticeable that in practice the common type of mind is more impressed with minutiae than with principles. The Southern European to-day will do murder on little provocation, but to eat meat in Lent is sin. But, without attributing such conspicuous sins as theft and adultery and murder to the Pharisees, it is clear that, in establishing their own righteousness, they laid excessive stress on the details of the law, on Sabbath-keeping (a constant topic with the Christian Apologists), on tithes, and temple ritual, on the washing of pots and plates—still rigorously maintained by the modern Jews—and all this was supposed to constitute holiness. Jesus with the clear incisive word of genius dismissed it all as "acting". The Pharisee was essentially an actor—playing to himself the most contemptible little comedies of holiness. Listen, cries Jesus, and he tells the tale of the man fallen among thieves and left for dead, and how priest and Levite passed by on the other side, fearing the pollution of a corpse, and how they left mercy, God's own work—'I will have mercy and not sacrifice' was one of his quotations from Hosea,—to be done by one unclean and damned—the Samaritan. Whited sepulchres! he cries, pretty to look at, but full of what? Of death, corruption and foulness.

'How *can* you escape from the judgment of hell?' he asked them, and no one records what they answered or could answer. It is clear, however, that outside Palestine, the Jews in the great world were moving to a more purely moral conception of religion—their environment made mere Pharisaism impossible, and Greek criticism compelled them to think more or less in the terms of the fundamental. The debt of the Jew to the Gentile is not very generously acknowledged. None the less, the distinctive badge of all his tribe was and remained what the Greeks called τὸ ψοφοδέες. The Sabbath, circumcision, the blood and butter taboos remained,—as they still remain in the most liberal of "Liberal Judaism"—tribe marks with no religious value, but maintained by patriotism. And side by side with this lived and lives that hatred of the Gentile which is attributed to Christian persecution, but which Juvenal saw and noted before the Christian had ceased to be persecuted by the Jew. The extravagant nonsense found in Jewish speculation as to how many Gentile souls were equivalent in God's sight to that of one Jew is symptomatic. To this day it is confessedly the weakness of Judaism that it offers no impulse and knows no enthusiasm for self-sacrificing love where the interests of the tribe are not concerned."

In passing we may commiserate with the Liberal Jews who, despite all their efforts and proclamations, are still accused of maintaining the Sabbath and the blood and butter taboos, and that too from motives of Jewish patriotism, and of hating the Gentile from motives of tribal loyalty. But more seriously the whole passage betrays no less ignorance than prejudice. It is what Mr. Glover would call "symptomatic" that he treats the story of the Good Samaritan as an example of Pharisaic narrowness, though the Priest and Levite who passed on the other side of the road would more probably have belonged to the Sadducee than the Pharisee sect, and though at least one acute critic has argued that the Samaritan himself was substituted in a later gloss to the text for an 'Israelite'. (See Halévy, *REJ.*, IV, 249.) The 'Israelite' would point the contrast better with the Priest and Levite, and Samaritans did not live in the neighborhood of Jericho. It is true that the New Testament has not recorded the answer of the Pharisees whom Jesus reproached—the Chronicler was careful about that—but we may be allowed

to answer for them that the Pharisees realized as clearly as Jesus that holiness depended upon inward purity, (as a perusal of the Ethics of the Fathers in the Jewish Prayer-book would show), that it was a Pharisee who enunciated before Jesus the golden rule, that it was not play-acting but a lofty theory of morals which led them to lay stress upon daily conduct and to interweave religion with the common concerns of man, and that, as Josephus put it, other peoples made religion a part of virtue, but the Jewish teachers ordained virtue to be a part of religion. (Josephus c. Apionem II, 17.) The most elementary knowledge of the teaching of the most distinguished Jewish sage in the time of Jesus would have convinced Mr. Glover that it is absurd to suppose that the Rabbis ranked the prescripts about tithes and pot and pans—which were not in fact determined for hundreds of years after Jesus—on a level with the great moral principles. Was it not Hillel who said that the whole law was summed up in the maxim: "Do not unto others what thou wouldst not that they should do to thee:—all the rest is commentary thereon", implying that humanity is the object of the law? And was it not Hillel again who said that it was the duty of man "to love his fellow-creatures and bring them near to the Torah," representing the dominant ideal of Judaism which was to spread Jewish teaching over the world? Mr. Glover rather intensifies than mitigates the injustice of his account in a footnote to the passage we have quoted. "Of course every general statement," he adds, "requires modification, but the predominantly tribal character of Judaism implies contempt for the spiritual life of the Gentile Christian and Pagan. If the knowledge of God was or is of value to the Jew, he made little effort to share it." To say the least, it is unkind to bring this reproach against a people who, when Christianity was established as the religion of the Roman Empire, were forbidden under penalty of death to make any converts, and who, when the Church became the dominant power in Europe, were massacred, tortured, and burnt at the stake in thousands for remaining loyal to their religion. The self-sacrificing love, which the Jew so painfully lacks, meant for the Christian Church, so far as history teaches, the love of sacrificing others who would not accept the exact dogmatic teaching which it held at any epoch. But we protest in the name of truth as well as of justice against

the charge that before they were repressed by the ruthless legislation of Christendom, the Jews were tribal and exclusive, or remiss in preaching their faith among the Gentiles. The New Testament itself is here evidence against Mr. Glover, when it speaks of these narrow self-centered Pharisees as scouring earth and sea to make a proselyte, or when it records that Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, had journeyed to Ephesus to preach the word of God to the pagans. Apart from Philo and Josephus who speak over and over again of the missionary activity and success of the Jew in all parts of the world—but who, Mr. Glover may say, are partial historians—the pagan authorities are as explicit, if less exultant, about the rapid spread of Judaism. Mr. Glover might, on this point, have consulted his classical authors, whom he knows so well. “The Jews,” says Strabo, “have penetrated into every state, so that it is difficult to find a single place in the world in which their tribe has not been received and become dominant.” Horace refers to Sabbath-observance as a common habit at Rome, which was practised by the man in the street (*unus multorum*): and Seneca, fierce anti-Semite that he was, writing after Palestine had been placed under a Roman governor, says: “Nevertheless the practices of this accursed race have so far prevailed that they have been received over the whole world: the vanquished have imposed their laws upon the victors.” Indeed the most constant accusation against the Jew is that he will not keep his religion to himself, but insists on propagating it among his neighbors.

But what of the passage in which Juvenal notes the Jewish hatred of the Gentile? Juvenal wrote one hundred years after the time of Jesus, when hundreds of thousands of Jews had been massacred by the Gentiles in the terrible wars of extermination that followed the fall of Jerusalem and the revolt against Trajan. Is it strange that in the year 100 or 120 C. E., Jews should have felt some hatred towards the Romans? Or is it disgraceful that they should have felt some ‘contempt for the spiritual life’ of the pagan with its untranslateable abominations that Juvenal has described? Were not the Christians also charged by pagan writers with ‘odium humani generis?’ And against the fancies of a particular Rabbi, who played with the equation of souls, may not we set, on the one hand, the saying of another Rabbi who explained the verse

of Isaiah: "Open ye the gates that the righteous people may enter in", to mean that one of the Gentiles who fulfils the laws of the Torah is as good as the High-priest himself:—one might add a hundred explanations to the same effect—and, on the other hand, the savagery of one of Mr. Glover's Christian worthies, Tertullian, quoted in this book, who shows his love of the Gentiles in these words: "You are fond of spectacles. Expect the greatest of all spectacles, the last and eternal judgment of the universe. How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult when I behold so many proud monarchs and fancied gods groaning in the lower abyss of darkness, so many magistrates who persecuted the name of the Lord liquefying in fierce fires that they once kindled against the Christians, so many sage philosophers blushing in red hot flames with their deluded scholars!" (*De Spectaculis* 30).—"Hath not a Jew hands, organs, senses, affections, passions"? is it that what is tribal narrowness in him becomes righteous indignation in the Christian?

Judaism had the same aspiration as Christianity to be a universal religion, and the Christians learnt from Jews to be missionaries, and were at first nothing more than a heretical Jewish sect, professing to carry out their mission in a special way. Tertullian admits that the early Church grew up "under the shadow of the Jews", but, to apply Mr. Glover's words, the debt of the Christian to the Jew has not been very generously acknowledged. It has been repaid in blood—of the Jew. As Christianity expanded, it departed more and more from the teachings of its founder as well as from Judaism, and its progress pointed to the Rabbis the danger of indiscriminate conversion and compromise with foreign ideas. In those mad centuries, when, together with the Roman Empire, the whole ancient civilization was breaking up and dissolving in the melting-pot of crude superstitions and hybrid creeds, the Rabbis were at pains to preserve the integrity and purity of Judaism by strengthening its outer defences. It was otherwise with the Church at this period. Mr. Glover claims that Jesus had once for all set religion free from the servitude of ritual and taboos; yet between the second and fifth centuries the Church was establishing the worse and harsher servitude of dogmas and beliefs, which for hundreds of years was to be, and which still is in some countries, immeasur-

ably more oppressive upon the mind than ever the Pharisaic development of the law was upon the body or the spirit. The moment Christianity emerged out of the region of spirit and began to establish itself as a world-religion, it was compelled to devise some bond which would hold its members together; and having rejected the law of conduct it chose the law of belief. When it became successful, as Renan admitted, the Church deteriorated; and brought into the world a new and awful tyranny, combining the ecclesiastical bigotry with the temporal powers of the Roman Empire; it established a merciless domination over conscience, and compelled Judaism to become, what it had never desired to be, an exclusive national religion; and had it not been for the stedfastness of the Jew, it would have stamped out his religion altogether. Perhaps the Christian world would not be so hard on the Pharisees, even the Pharisees of its imagination, if it remembered the Church-synods of history.

The story is told of a girl who, when asked if there were any wild beasts in England, replied "No, except in the Theological Gardens." Her language was doubtless too strong, but it is in the theological gardens that the pests of prejudice and misrepresentation live longest. Mr. Glover speaks of the different attitude of the Christian world since the Renaissance to the evidences of Christianity from miracle and prophecy; we may hope that as the historical criticism of the nineteenth century enters into men's minds, the attitude of the Christian world may change to the evidences of Christianity from the narrowness and soullessness of Pharisaic religion, and that writers upon the time of Jesus may deign to correct Paul's controversial account of Judaism by at least a superficial study of the Jewish records of the age.

London

NORMAN BENTWICH

PROFESSOR CLAY'S "AMURRU"

Amurru: The home of the Northern Semites. A study showing that the Religion and Culture of Israel are not of Babylonian origin. By ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph. D., Professor of Semitic Philology and Archæology, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES Co., 1909. 217 pages.

It requires great courage to challenge established ideas. For more than ten years it has become a dogma with a great many scholars—or to adopt the term that Prof. Clay and others apply to them, the Pan-Babylonians—that Babylonia had extensively influenced the culture and religion of Israel, and that the very foundations upon which the Jewish and Christian religion rests are borrowed from the Babylonian mythology. The foremost champion of these current opinions is Prof. Hugo Winckler of Berlin.

In opposing these views, the author's main contentions are that not only are these opinions void and baseless, but that a great many features of the Sumero-Babylonian culture and religion hitherto considered as having been developed in the Tigris-Euphrates valley had their origin and proper home in the Westland,—Amurru—the home of Israel.

The book consists of two parts and an appendix. In the first part the author outlines in introductory remarks the point of view of the Pan-Babylonians and controverts the foundations upon which their theories are based. Then he deals with the early stories in Genesis, of the Creation, Sabbath, antediluvian Patriarchs and the Deluge, the principal material for the support of the theory that Israel's literature is dependent upon that of Babylonia. These stories, including the Babylonian versions, are, in his opinion, west-Semitic. He proceeds to prove that the

original home of Semitic culture is the Westland, whence the Semites emigrated to Babylonia.

In the second part the author contends that most of the deities of the Semitic Babylonians, which have been recognized as sun-gods, had their origin in the great solar deity of the Western Semites, known as Amar or Mar and Ur, which was written in the script of the West אִמַּר or מַר, and אֹור or וּר, also known as שֶׁמֶשׁ. He demonstrates that these divine names are actually found in proper names of the Old Testament, as well as in those of West Semitic inscriptions.

In the appendix the author locates the city Ur of the Chaldees, explains the names of Jerusalem and Sargon King of Accad, and discusses the reading of NIN-IB and of Yahweh.

Within the narrow compass of a review it is hardly possible to give even the shortest outlines of the contents of this volume. All the suggestions of the author, though some of them are for the present only of hypothetical value, are of importance for the history of Israel.

This book will not appeal to Winckler and his followers. They are firm in their belief, and no proofs and arguments will disturb their minds. They will still adhere to their cherished ideas. If one does not agree with them, he is looked upon as reactionary and consequently of no account, and they do not trouble themselves to argue with men of this kind. But there are still a great many scholars without prejudice, and they will attach the right value to it. Its main points are as follows:

The religion of Israel is not to be regarded as being composed of transformed Babylonian and Assyrian myths. The anthropomorphic character of the gods enables us to find parallels for practically everything that took place in the lives of all Biblical characters. The foundations of Israel's history are not based upon an astral conception of the universe, since it has recently been proved that the science of astronomy was developed in Babylonia between the fourth and second century B. C. and did not take its rise in the early period of Babylonian history. There is no proof of such an astral conception in the Old Testament. It would be quite inconsistent with the legislation of Israel. No

iota of evidence has been produced to discredit the accounts of the Old Testament concerning the origin of the Hebrews.

The lack of archæological remains in Palestine is due to the fact that Israel used perishable material for ordinary writing purposes. Besides, it apparently did not develop the plastic art. The excavations do not show any Babylonian influence in the Israelitish or pre-Israelitish time. The monuments of Egypt furnish ample proof that the civilization of Syria-Palestine is Semitic and is as old as that of Egypt, if not older. The elements of culture that migrated from Babylonia to Egypt must have been first adopted by the inhabitants of Syria and transmitted by them. The discovery of two Babylonian epics in Tell-el-Amarna furnishes no evidence for the influence of Babylonia upon Canaan. They were text-books for learning the language, as they were interpunctuated, the words being separated by marks made with ink. Canaan was not at the time of the Exodus a domain of Babylonian culture; for, if it were, we should expect the chief deity of the Babylonians, Marduk, who a millennium prior to the Exodus had been the head of the Babylonian pantheon, to figure prominently in the West.

No proof is forthcoming that the Babylonian system of laws had been enforced upon the people of Canaan. The parallel laws in the Mosaic Code and in the Code of Hammurabi can be explained as coincidences which have arisen from similar conditions. Even a common origin for both cannot be proved.

The Sumerians no doubt greatly influenced the Semitic culture which was brought into the country; the Semites, on the other hand, had a great influence upon the Sumerians.

In the Babylonian Creation-legend upon which the Biblical Creation story is said to be dependent, there are two cosmologies amalgamated. One represents a Semitic myth coming from the West, in which Marduk, the God of light, is arrayed against Tiamat, the God of darkness; the other is a Sumerian myth, presumably from Eridu, resulting in the establishment of order by Ea, as against the chaos which is personified by Apsu. This amalgamation took place some time prior to the establishment of Ashurbanipal's library where this legend was found.

Sabbath is not of Babylonian origin. The Babylonian word *shabbatum* is a synonym of *gamaru* "to be complete, to be full" and was the name of the fifteenth day of the month and it doubtless had reference, as has been suggested, to the full moon in the middle of the month. The days of the calendar of festivals for the intercalary months, second Elul and Marheshvan, in which the duties of the King are prescribed for the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth and nineteenth days, were not days of rest for the people. Investigations prove that in the Assyrian period, in the 8th and 7th centuries B. C., these days, with exception of the 19th, do not show any marked abstention from business transactions. The figures that have been produced to show that in the time of Abraham there is a noticeable abstention on these days, in contrast to the first day of the month, do not prove anything, as long as we do not know whether other days besides the first day of the month were especially auspicious for business transactions. Traces of resting on the Sabbath could have their origin in West Semitic communities founded by people led into captivity. The root from which the word Sabbath is derived is almost unknown in the Assyrian-Babylonian language, while its usage in the Hebrew language is widely extended.

The names of the antediluvian mythological kings handed down by Berosus are West Semitic and quite different from those of the antediluvian patriarchs of Genesis. Thus the view held by many scholars that the names of the Hebrew list, in part at least, are direct translations of the Babylonian names is untenable. And it is unreasonable to assume that the Jewish priests learned in their ancient cult and in their ancestral history should have adopted as their own antecedents—the antediluvian patriarchs—the mythological kings of a country that robbed them not only of their independence but also deported them and held them in bondage. If the Jews who returned to Palestine had been so extensively influenced by the Babylonian religion and history, we should suppose that the Jews who remained in the land would have been influenced even more in this direction. It does not seem to have been the case. The Babylonian Talmud was written in that land by the descendants of those that remained.

The origin of the Babylonian Deluge legend goes back to a West-Semitic narrative which is parent also to the Biblical version. The original seat of the Semitic culture was not Southern Arabia, though the Arabic represents the purest Semitic language. There was no important center of culture in Arabia. The earliest influence upon Babylonia from Arabia was the time of the Hammurabi dynasty. But they like the Cassite Kings did not seem to have influenced the Babylonian culture. The Semites must have migrated to Babylonia at the latest in the fourth or fifth millennium B. C. entering from the North.

As the Semitic Babylonian is more closely related to the Aramaic and Hebraic (or Amoraic) than to the Arabic and Abyssinian, it ought to follow that the Babylonian, Hebraic and Aramaic tongues were at one time the same language. There is no support for the view that the language of Palestine in the time of Abraham was simply a dialect of Arabia; or that the Arameans at that time were still a part of the Arab race.

The inscriptions and archæological finds of contemporaneous peoples have corroborated the early history in the Old Testament of the nations of antiquity. The name of "Abram" has been discovered. Concerning the origin of the worship of Yahweh, the Old Testament furnishes the only light on the subject, contrary to the modern views that the name and worship of Yahweh came from the Arameans; and as Abraham and his ancestors, as well as his descendants were Arameans, it follows that the name and worship of Yahweh were familiar to the Arameans. Among the figurative expressions under which Yahweh is represented in the Old Testament, there are those which point to Aramaic origin. His characteristics are identical with those of the Aramean God Adad. Naturally there is no more proof for saying, as has been suggested, that the worship of Yahweh is derived from that of Adad than that the worship of Adad came from that of Yahweh. It would be safer to say that these characteristic marks which both deities have in common point to their Aramaic origin.

The name of Yahweh is to be found on two old Babylonian tablets in the oath formula. One is said to be from Kish, in the reign of Rim-Anum, who ruled in the latter part of the third millennium B. C. The second is dated in the reign of Sumuabum of

the Hammurabi dynasty. These tablets contain names of Western Semites. Hence it is quite reasonable to expect the name of Yahweh, if the deity was Aramean or West-Semitic.

The West Semitic deity (שמש and אור, מר, אמר) after having been transplanted to Babylonia by the Semites, appeared under different written forms in different localities, as NER-URUGAL in Cutha, AMAR-UTUG in Babylon. These Sumerian forms in time were Semitized and became Nergal and Marduk. With later streams of immigration coming from the West, the name in the original form continued to be brought into the country; but coming in, when the early Sumerian forms of the Semitic names, as well as the religion, had been Babylonized, they were treated as distinct deities. There are a great many proofs that these movements from the West actually took place. The variant forms of the West Semitic solar deity are: Uru, Nergal, Marduk, NIN-IB, Urush, Shamash, Adad, Nusku, Ishum, Sarpanitum, Bunene and Malik. Besides these solar deities, there are other gods as well to be considered as an importation from the West, as Ashur, Ishtar, Anu and Antum, Nabu, Sin, Dagan, Lahmu and Lahamu.

The Babylonian script, besides the argument based on the culture, offers strong evidence in support of this thesis. In the Babylonian script the weaker consonants or radicals are elided or contracted, or appear as vowels. A study of the script of the Northern group of languages makes it most difficult to understand, if the Babylonian is the older language, how the weak radicals, which had disappeared, should have been restored, and the roots correctly introduced in the alphabetic script of the Western languages. For example, it is difficult to understand how Bel, Uru and Tiamat or the corresponding *belu*, *uru* and *tamdu* should be correctly introduced as תהום, אור, בעל. In the Old Testament, the only form of the name of the land known as Amurru, refers to the inhabitants, and appears with the Gentilic ending, i. e. Amori. From the Old Testament it would seem that Amorite history reached far back into antiquity, and that the people had maintained their identity down to the Hebrew period. As a nation, however, they had begun to disintegrate and were losing prestige. The domination of the Hittites in the middle of

the second millennium doubtless brought this about. The chief location of the Amorites was the mountainous region north of what we now recognize as Palestine, covering the district, it seems, as far north as the Orontes. In the Tell-el-Amarna letters the names of the districts are practically all Semitic. As geographical names are frequently retained from one era to another, we realize that the inhabitants of the land prior to this age in all probability were Semites. The predominance of Semitic personal names is evident in these letters. They betray the fact that the native tongue of the writer is Hebraic. Although we know that Aryans or perhaps Turanians also lived there, we may conclude that most of the people in that region not only spoke a Semitic language, but in the early period were Semites and that the land was at a very early time an important center of Semitic culture.

Bearing in mind that the solar worship of the Babylonians goes back to Amurru, we should find many traces of the worship in that land in which it was indigenous. Inasmuch as the Amorites figure so prominently in the early period of Palestine, it is reasonable to expect to find in the Old Testament traces of the worship of that chief deity of this people whose name is written Amurru, Uru, etc., as well as אור in the Aramaic of Babylonia. The name seems to be found in אורי, אוריאל, אוריהו, אוריה, and שרי אור. The deity is also found in the Amarna letters in the name Milkuru. The same name, written Mil-ki-U-ri is found in an Assyrian document dated in the reign of Sargon. This name is perhaps to be seen in Uru(MAR-TU)-Ma-lik, dated in the first dynasty of Babylon. Identical with this name is ארמלך, found in a Phoenician inscription. אריאל, a name applied to Jerusalem, may also contain the element. The name occurs also in the Aramaic Zakir inscription, written אלור = El-Ur. The writing ור for the name of the deity, we find in Punic inscriptions. If ור in West Semitic inscriptions represents Uru, we should expect יר in the Hebrew script, as initial ו usually passes into י. This writing seems to be found in the name ירבעל. Alongside of Ur we find Mar in Aramaic and Phoenician inscriptions. The mountain מריה and the name מריבעל may also contain this element.

It is a general opinion that "Ur of the Chaldees", the home of Abraham, is identical with Urumma or Uru. This opinion rests upon the fact that Uru was called Camarina, according to Eupolemos; *kamar* in Arabic means "Moon", and Uru was in ancient days dedicated to the moon-deity; Terah, the Father of Abraham, journeyed to Harran, another city dedicated to the moon-god. But Uru was the seat of Nannar worship and not of the moon-god, Sin. The identification of Nannar with Sin belongs to a late period. The geographical term Chaldea does not seem to include lower Babylonia. There was, however, a town in the vicinity of Sippar, called Amurru. This region can properly be included in Chaldea. This town, while apparently a city of some prominence in the time of the first dynasty, is not mentioned in the subsequent periods. A large percentage of the residents of Sippar could have been carried into exile by some previous Elamite or Babylonian conqueror, knowing the account of Chedorlaomer's campaign, how he carried away Lot and the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. This city Amurru = Ur is in Chaldea; it thrived at the time that the patriarch lived; its location was later lost sight of; it was inhabited by a West Semitic people and its name is the same as is written in the Old Testament.

The author has doubtless attained his object in showing that the religion and culture of Israel are not of Babylonian origin. Not all of his arguments are entirely convincing. There is no need that they should be so. The Pan-Babylonians who claim the property of Israel must show cause why and justify their claims. If they are not well founded, Israel would get the benefit of the doubt and be left in the possession of his old inheritance. The author has shown at least, it must be admitted, that Israel can turn the tables and claim for itself what has been held to be the property of Babylonia.

It seems, however, to the reviewer that the author overlooked one important point. If there was a culture in Canaan independent of that of the Sumero-Babylonians, there must have been a script. It could not have been the alphabetic writing of the later period. The Semites who emigrated from the West to Babylonia would hardly have taken over the cumbersome syllabic writing of the

Sumerians. It must have been a picture-writing, the archetype of our alphabet. No traces of it are to be found. May we identify with it the Hittite picture-writing? The future will perhaps decide this question.

The writer does not see any reason why the author insists that the two cosmologies were amalgamated in a late period prior to the establishment of Ashurbanipal's library. It could have been done in the time of Abraham, before he left Babylonia, since at that period Marduk was already the head of the Babylonian pantheon, or at least long before the Exodus. Otherwise the author would have to admit that the biblical Creation story is dependent upon the legend of Ashurbanipal's library. It would be improbable to assume that both stories amalgamated both cosmologies independently.

If Apsu was a West Semitic deity, the Sumerian myth would be West Semitic as well.

In the light of the author's arguments, it is indeed doubtful if the institution of the Sabbath could be traced to Babylonia. In itself it would not matter if such proved to be the case. There was never any doubt that it was not a Mosaic institution, but an old Hebrew day of rest. It was observed, according to the Bible, before the Revelation on Mount Sinai took place. The author of the Pentateuch, in connecting this institution with the Creation, implied that it ought to be a day of rest for all human beings. We may presume that Abraham already observed it, as the Talmud maintains, as well as his ancestors who were Babylonians. The common people of Babylonia engaged in business may have gradually neglected its observance altogether. The modern Jews are doing the same. Like the latter, they were not willing or could not afford to lose a day's work every week. It was only observed by the king and priests who had nothing else to do, and whose duty it was to uphold old institutions. And even they, in the course of time, were not inclined to rest one day in every week, especially as the priests became business men, and so restricted it to the days of the intercalary month. Thus the origin of the institution sank into oblivion. The Sabbath could have been originally intended as a day of rest for everybody. The seventh day was said to have

been chosen for this purpose, as the day was unfavorable to business, so the people would not lose much by observing it and would be more inclined to do so. There are still traces in the Talmud that the Sabbath is astrologically an unfavorable day. The ancestors of the Hebrews having been simple shepherds had no reason for neglecting its observance and they might have observed it more or less at the time of the Exodus. Noteworthy in this connection is the Midrashic legend, that Pharaoh granted to the Israelites on the application of Moses the seventh day as a day of rest. Considering it from this point of view, we could explain why there was an abstention from business transactions in the festival days in the time of Hammurabi and not in the 8th and 7th centuries B. C.

If the antediluvian patriarchs and Babylonian mythological kings are based upon a common West Semitic inheritance, we should expect some resemblance in their names. The author could have maintained that the Biblical or West Semitic names of the patriarchs were partially translated into Babylonian.

In the opinion of the writer, however, even if we could prove that the stories of the Creation, antediluvian patriarchs and the Deluge have their origin in Babylonia, it would by no means support the claim that the Babylonian literature was absorbed by Israel as its own. We would raise the question: What have the Babylonian discoveries told us that was not known before? To every reader of the Bible endowed with simple common-sense it must have always been clear that the scene of these stories was laid around Babylonia, whence Abraham came. The Bible by no means disguises the fact. Suppose, that the Torah was actually written by Moses, and consider it as a literary work from a human point of view (there were a good many scholars before the discoveries of the cuneiform inscriptions, who did not believe in divine inspiration): Where did Moses get these stories from? It is improbable to assume that he invented them. The only reasonable explanation must always have been that they were handed down by the ancestors of the Hebrews. Since, however, these ancestors, according to the Bible (Joshua 24), were idolaters, they could not have handed them down in their present monotheistic

form. The only conclusion they could reach, must have been, that Moses altered and stripped these stories of their original polytheism.

Naturally they would have expected to find some day the original stories at the home of these pagan ancestors. Suppose these stories would not have been discovered. Why, the Bible would have lost its historical value and been considered as a book of fiction! To what terrible abuse might the biblical author have been exposed by our Assyriologists, decrying him as an impostor.

As to the Deluge it is noteworthy that the Talmud believes that all the people who perished in the Deluge were heaped up in Babylonia and that in Palestine there was no Deluge at all, that is to say, the incidents of the Deluge as told in Genesis 7,11.12 did not take place in Palestine. It was covered by waters coming from other countries.

The name and worship of Yahweh might have been familiar to the Arameans and perhaps also to the ancestors of Abraham. As a matter of fact, however, Abraham and his descendants did not worship God under this name. The fact that none of the descendants of Abraham before the time of the Exodus bears a name compounded with Yahweh (with the exception perhaps of the mother of Moses יוכבד) nor do any of the נשיאים enumerated in Num. 1, 5-16; 13, 4-16; 19-28, speaks volumes for the truth of the Biblical assertion that the name of Yahweh was unknown to them (Ex. 6, 3). Hence we understand what Pharaoh meant by saying that he did not know Yahweh (Ex. 5, 2). Moses restored to the highest position the name Yahweh used in days of yore (Gen. 4, 26). שדי was, in all probability, a national god of the mountainous region of Syria-Palestine, while Yahweh was explained אלהי אשר אלהי, the God whose power is everywhere. Naturally in a period when the Mosaic religion was not observed or nearly given up altogether, especially in North-Israel, the name Yahweh, though still retained, was identified with Shaddai, the god of the mountains, and that is the reason why the servants of Ben-Hadad called the God of Israel "a god of the mountains" (I Kings 20, 23). The prophet of Yahweh, however, repudiated indignantly this assertion

(*ibid.* 20, 28). He was most likely worshipped by the Arameans and Babylonians as god, but not as the god *par excellence*.

The author seems to have adopted unwittingly the Talmudic view that Canaan was originally in the possession of the descendants of Shem. The Talmud, however, asserts that in the time of Abraham the country was wrested from the Semites by a non-Semitic population called Canaanites, and that was the reason why God promised to give him back the inheritance of his ancestors. The modern researches concerning the Hittites give to the Talmudic legend a historical foundation.

It seems not improbable to the writer to assume that in the time of Abraham the Canaanites or Hittites were in the actual possession of the greatest part of Palestine and perhaps Phœnicia as well. In the Amarna-period, however, the time of the Exodus, the Semites were again the possessors of these countries. They could have in the meantime subjugated the Hittites and driven them back to their original home. The geographical name Canaan was retained by them as well as the other names of the non-Semitic tribes, just as the Anglo-Saxons were called Britons. From this point of view we would understand what the Bible means by saying **והכנעני אז בארץ** (Gen. 12, 6) "the real Canaanites were in the time of Abraham in the country, but no more in the time of Moses". Sidon could have been from the oldest times a stronghold of the Hittites, and therefore the Bible calls Sidon—the name does not matter—the first-born of Canaan. Several cities of Palestine, as Jerusalem, Shechem, Gerar and others may always have been in the possession of the Semites. It is remarkable that the Talmud does not say **הכנעני כבש הארץ** but **הולך וכובש הארץ**. The Talmud seems to have known more of the ancient history of Palestine, than we are inclined to give it credit for.

In fact it might almost seem a truism that in writing the history of antiquity the Jewish records should be given full credence. Yet this is far from having been the case. It is not the least of the merits of Professor Clay's book that he again points the way to this eminently sound method.

SHEM TOB BEN JOSEPH PALQUERA
A THINKER AND POET OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY
BY HENRY MALTER, Dropsie College

I

THE great German historian Ranke observes somewhere that the thirteenth century was the darkest in all human history. In proof thereof he points to the general antagonism among nations in their foreign policies, and to the low standard of their domestic institutions and ideals, social and political. It was the age inaugurated by the reign of Pope Innocent III, the Pope who, in Graetz's opinion, was responsible for all the ills from which European nations suffered up to the time of the Lutheran Reformation: the tyranny of the Roman church over princes and peoples; the enslavement and the degradation of the intellect; the persecution of the devotees of free research; the establishment of the Inquisition; the heaping up of the funeral pyres for heretics who dared question the infallibility of the Roman church.

A survey of this ominous century from the point of view of Jewish experience, serves only to corroborate Ranke's startling indictment. One sure test of the progress of a people and the stage of civilization they have attained is the treatment they accord to their dissenting minorities. The Jew in the Diaspora, always in the minority, thus serves as a measure of the culture of the nations among whom he

has dwelt.¹ That this era of "papal enlightenment" should mark the advent of the dark ages for the Jew is therefore sadly significant. This all-powerful ecclesiastical monarch, who enslaved Europe with a host of monks and spies, was also the bitterest enemy of the Jews and of Judaism, inflicting on them greater injury than all his predecessors. Inventor of the Inquisition and of the stake, deviser of tortures, author of the cruelest exceptional laws against the Jews, the founder of the Dominicans and Franciscans, orders that brought untold woe upon Israel—this is his baleful meaning for mediæval Jewry (Graetz, *Geschichte*, VII, 32).

I do not know whether Ranke had in mind conditions among the Jews when he pronounced his sweeping condemnation or not. At any rate, the intellectual activity of the Jews in the thirteenth century refutes for once at least the old proverb "*Wie es sich christelt, so jüdet es sich*". A foremost Jewish scholar, one who has never been charged with apologetic tendencies in behalf of Judaism, gives the following characterization of the age: "If we consider the Jewish literature in its entirety, we shall find here, as elsewhere, that the thirteenth century was a critical period of the utmost interest, both on account of its original achievements and of the developments to which it led. The storm and stress, the conflict of ideas in the thirteenth century, is no less significant than that of the nineteenth century."²

The thirteenth century was not, indeed, an age of originality. It cannot boast of thinkers and poets of the creative power of Solomon Ibn Gabirol or Judah Halevi. Jewish philosophy had attained its culmination earlier in

¹ Berthold Auerbach, *Lebensgeschichte Spinoza's*, Stuttgart 1871, p. xvii.

² Steinschneider, *JQR.*, XVII, 354.

Maimonides. On the other hand, however, in this age, intellectual activity and literary production in religious and secular fields extended over a wider and more varied range than ever before.

These features of the age are reflected in the history of Jewish literature. The learning of Gaonic times and the period following is associated with only few prominent names. The masses, as it appears from the literature of that time, were but little affected by the intellectual aspirations of the great scholars. In the thirteenth century, however, the number of scholars increased remarkably, above all in the field of Talmudic research. The interest of the masses becomes widespread. How else can we explain the universal interest in the great controversy over the writings of Maimonides and the study of philosophy, a controversy which assumed such wide proportions, and entered so deeply into the life of thirteenth century Jewry?

As center for this widespread learning of the age, Provence stood second only to Spain. Its geographical situation made it the meeting point for the scientific culture developed under Arabic influence in Spain and the Talmudic learning of the French Jews. In Provence the last of the compilers of the Haggadah lived. There, since the time of Ibn Tibbon, numerous translators were busied with Arabic works, and there in the thirteenth century secular learning continued to be cultivated with zeal and enthusiasm. There also appeared many famous scholars, who united a comprehensive knowledge of the Talmud with broad general learning, and who exerted a lasting influence upon later ages. As the most famous we need mention only Moses Nahmanides, Solomon ben Adret, and Menahem Meiri.

An age in which intellectual interest is keen, is usually characterized on the one hand by an abundance of works on a great variety of themes, and on the other hand by much mediocrity on the part of their authors. Moreover, there are always more men of talent than of genius; and with education popularized, the half-educated are allured to authorship. The result is literary over-production. The literary history of the thirteenth century with its vast output of books and the comparative paucity of great authors is another illustration of the rule.

The general situation in the thirteenth century is dwelt upon at some length, because the subject of this essay is one of those men who are clearly the products of the environment and the reflection of their time, and not one of the few who are pioneers and heralds of a later age. Shem Tob ben Joseph Palquera is not eminent as the creator of a new movement or the embodiment of a new tendency. His work and thought, however, reflect better than that of any of his contemporaries, the scientific aspirations of the Jews of his time, and his life may serve, therefore, to give us a deeper insight into the stirring intellectual and spiritual life of the thirteenth century.

Considering the productivity of Shem Tob Palquera as philosopher and poet, it is surprising how little is known of his private life. His birthplace was in all probability one of the provinces on the Franco-Iberian boundary. Of his childhood, his education, his family, little is known with certainty. Not even the year of his birth is specifically recorded anywhere. In a work written in 1264, he speaks of himself as nearing his fortieth year, and on this basis, 1225 is assumed as the year of his birth. So meager are the data concerning Palquera, that the origin and even the cor-

rect spelling and pronunciation of his family name are uncertain.³

Of the circumstances of his later life, we know but little more. We cannot say definitely how he supported himself. It appears that he remained unmarried. The year of his death is even less certain than that of his birth. We hear of him for the last time in 1290, as a participant in the debate between the Maimonists and anti-Maimonists. His life thus coincided with the greater part of the thirteenth century.

In the absence of more definite information on the life and death of Palquera, biography is out of the question, unless we are ready to accept the figments of our imagination as fact. Under the circumstances, we can do no more than examine with care the works of Palquera which time has spared, and infer from the letter to the spirit, educe from their order and contents, something of the motives and ideals which inspired the author's career.

Palquera was by nature a modest, retiring man, a dreamer, leading the contemplative life, and looking out

³ The name occurs in Hebrew in various forms, e. g. פלאקיר, פלכרה, פלאקירא, בלקירה, פלקיירא, etc. The transliteration into modern languages by recent authors varies accordingly: Falaquera, *JE.*, s. v.; Palaquera, Phalchera, Palquira, etc. We adopt with Steinschneider (*Al-Farabi*, 176) the pronunciation Palquera = פלקירא which occurs most frequently. The derivation of the name, which was shared by two other scholars, namely Joel and his son Nathan (comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 842) from Beaucaire in France, is doubted by Steinschneider (*Hebr. Bibl.*, XX, 17; comp. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1894, p. 1637-8), as it seems to me, without ground, considering the fact that Moses of Salon is referred to in manuscripts as Moses רבילקייר, רבילקיירי, רבילקיירא, which place Steinschneider himself identified with Beaucaire (*Hebr. Übers.*, § 87); see also *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXI, 412 ff.; see also Venetianer's Introduction to his edition of Palquera's ספר המעלות = "Book of the Degrees (of Men)", Berlin 1894, p. vii, n. 2.

upon the world through the spectacles of the philosopher and the poet. His was not the world of stern reality and cold fact, but the world evolved from the riches of a creative imagination, and the deep feelings of a sensitive soul. What room was there for a man of his refined temperament in a world ruled over by St. Louis and his dull and dismal confrères—for him, the Jew, despised, branded with the yellow badge of degradation, harassed and persecuted? One of his poems reflects feelingly the circumstances amid which he and his fellow Jews lived:

Can the lorn Jew be joyous, when
Accursed is his lot among men?
For, tho' to-day his wealth be more
Than sand upon the ocean's shore,
To-morrow goes he stripped and sore.
What justice can there be for Jew,
His foe being judge and jury, too?
Or how should Israel raise his head,
Wallowing in blood and sore-bestead?
O God, redeem Thy people's state,
And glorify and vindicate
Thy name, which foes now desecrate!"

הישמח היהודי האומלל
וחלקו בין בני אדם מקולל
ואם היום יהי עשרו כחול ים
למחר יהלך ערום ושולל.
ומה יצדק ילוד יעקב ויזכה
בעור אויבו ידינהו ופֿלל
ואיך ירים לראשו ישראל
והנה הוא בדם מכות מגולל.
אלהים עמך הושע אשר אז
תקדש את שמך המחולל!

From the discomforts and sorrows of life in an untoward world, his spirit sought solace in the less tangible but more happy and exalted realm of biblical and talmudic study, and Greek and Arabic speculation—"the realm wherein the wise and the learned are crowned, and dwell ever delighting in the presence and glory of God."⁵

From this retreat not even the ambition to attain to the much-coveted scholar's fame, lured Palquera. For him knowledge and learning were not currency with which to purchase earthly goods, but ends in themselves. What is fame, he asks; what are the good things of this world compared with the soul's satisfaction that comes from the search after truth?⁶

Animated by these beliefs, Palquera turned his back upon the world and devoted himself more and more to a life of contemplation and study. From the few vague allusions to his personal history, it appears, as already noted, that he never married,⁷ and never filled any public position. He does not seem to have taken up any fixed abode, but wandered like most of his coreligionists of the time, driven from place to place, leading a precarious existence.⁸ He

(מבקש, ed. Hague, 1779, p. 6b). The metrical version of this and other poems which I shall have occasion to cite, I owe to the kindness of Rabbi Harry W. Ettelson.

⁵ See his commentary on Maimonides' Guide, מורה המורה, 142.

⁶ ראשית חכמה, published by M. David, Berlin 1902, 7f.; comp. Steinschneider, *Al-Farabi*, 177.

⁷ Comp. ספר המעלות, 60; Steinschneider, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, l. c.

⁸ וכל גבר יראה עני בשבט עברת זמנו
ויע ונד בארץ לבקש מזונו,
והתלאה סובבת מכל עבר
ומכל צד יבוא השוד והשבר
עד [כין] מתוק לאיש רגבי נחל ולשקוד על גדיש וקבר.

seems to have known the bitterness of poverty, for he returns to that theme more than once in his poems.

Poverty and Death,—these both,
Ah, are ills intensified!
But, if 'twixt them you must choose,
Death, the preferable, decide!⁹

He, too, found that riches and devotion to learning are not often mated. With a trace of bitterness alien to his nature, he laments:

Behold how Fate impoverisheth the wise,
But gives the witless fortune's every prize!
Sooner with water fire may combine,
Than that both wealth and wisdom should be thine.¹⁰

The homage paid to the vulgar rich inspired his muse to a striking bit of satire:

Who to a "No-account" his deference shows
Because of stylish looks and costly clothes,

(מבקש, 3a). Palquera speaks there not only of himself, but of men's fate in general.

9

שפלות חיים וכאב מות
בשניהם משנה שברון
אם אי אפשר לאיש מזה
או זה — יש במות יתרון.

(ib., 9b, and "Book of the Degrees," 51). Comp. משלי חכמים, in צוואת ר' הקבר ולא: 54, No. 21, ed. Steinschneider, Berlin 1852, p. 21, No. 54: יהודה אבן תבון העיוני.

10

זמן יוריש מתי חכמה ויעשיר
כסילים וחסר[י] לב יאשר
ומים תאסוף עם אש בידך
בטרם תאסוף חכמה ועשר.

(ib., 8a).

Is like to one, who would a corpse admire
For being buried in rich silk-attire.¹¹

His scanty wants he satisfied in various ways. Some income, it seems, he derived from his patrimony. He may also have practiced medicine.¹² For the physicians of his day he does not appear to have great esteem; witness the bantering tone of this poem:

Quoth Fate unto the Fool: "A doctor be,
Who, killing folks off, netteth income large;
So hast thou vantage o'er Death's Angel;—He
Must take the lives of people free of charge!"¹³

He was also a writer of occasional poems, and probably in the fashion of the time, received gifts from wealthy patrons. This occupation, however, he early abjured as

11

נפש תוקיר כסיל לפי
פניו או הוד סותו דומה
למכבד מת יען קברו
אותו בתכריכי רקמה .

(*ib.*, 10a).

¹² Both are conjectures of Steinschneider, *Literaturzeitung*, I. c., based on passages in *המעלות*, 50, 63. The first suggestion, however, is not sufficiently borne out by the text referred to; see end of next note.

13

אמר זמן לכסיל היה רופא
תמית בני אדם וקח ממונם
לך יתרון על מלאכי מות
כי הם ימיתון האנוש בחנם .

(*ib.*, 15 b, translated metrically into German by Steinschneider, *Manna*, 83). Palquera is, however, not the author of this epigram, and, therefore, introduces it with the words *ואמר המשורר*, by which he probably refers to its author, Joseph Ibn Zebara (about 1200), in whose *ספר שעשועים* (published in *יין לבנון*, Paris 1866), p. 26, it first occurs; comp. Steinschneider, *ZfhB.*, VIII, 187, No. 5. Aside from this, it is not always safe to conclude from such epigrams as to the real opinion of the author. In *המעלות*, 63, Palquera recommends the practice of medicine as the "noblest of all human occupations", from which passage Steinschneider inferred that he was a physician; see the preceding note.

little suited to his taste and temperament.¹⁴ Eking out thus an uncertain livelihood, he nevertheless did not complain of his lot, forgetting hardship in his devotion to learning.

We should be in error, if we inferred from Palquera's indifference to wealth and power and his absorption in study and contemplation that he was one of the dreary ascetics, so numerous at that time in the church, with whom mortification of the flesh was a merit. From such phantastic doctrines he was saved by the teachings of Judaism, to which asceticism has on the whole been repugnant, and by the Aristotelian ethics, which warned its disciples to avoid all extremes. The Aristotelian ethics of the golden mean found in Palquera a disciple scarcely less devoted than his master Maimonides; and he continued to teach it with all the emphasis with which it had been expounded by the greatest of the Jewish philosophers.¹⁵ Palquera's views were

¹⁴ Comp. below, note 50.

¹⁵ Of the numerous passages in which he gives expression to this Aristotelian doctrine the following one may be quoted: כל איש אשר לבו נדבנו ללכת באורח מישור.... יעמיד בדרך האמצעי פעליו וירחיק מהקצות מעלליו.... ולא יצא מן התוך אל הקצה ותו' אמרו (חולין נ"ח:) כל יתר כנטול דמי וארסמו אומר התוספת על הגבול חסרון מהמוגבל ואמר הדברים הטובים הם הממוצעים, ראשית חכמה, 2a, 3a, 17a, 18b; מבקש 5, 5; comp. *ib.*, 76 *et passim*: 10). This theory has become a creed with the Jewish as well as with some Arabic philosophers. Gazzali, one of the most orthodox representatives of Islam, even goes so far as to interpret the words **اهدنا الصراط المستقيم** (= "lead us in the straight path") of the first sura of the Koran, which constitutes the Lord's Prayer of the Mohammedans, as referring to the middle way advocated by the Stagirite (מאוני צרק, 96; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 344, n. 604). It is worth noticing that Palquera introduces the passage quoted above by the interpretation of a talmudic passage (Moed Katan 5a) which he took from Maimonides' "Eight Chapters", iv, end. The same was done by Abraham Ibn Hisdai, the Hebrew translator of Gazzali, *l. c.*, who has replaced all the quotations of the Arabic original from Mohammedan sources by quotations of similar content from Bible and Talmud;

thus, far removed from those of the cloistered monk, to whom the body was the work of the devil, and the pleasures of the senses, sinful. His attitude toward sensual enjoyments was that of the philosopher, who calmly weighs the delights of earth, and arrives at the conviction that while earthly happiness is indeed worth striving after, it cannot be an end in itself, but only means for the refinement of

comp. his own words about it in his Introduction to the work, p. 4. Among Jewish philosophers Saadia was the first to make this doctrine the basis of his Ethics (*Al-Amānāt*, chapter X; comp. Dukes, *Salomon b. Gabirol*, 29). It was then accepted by Ibn Gabirol (Dukes, *l. c.*, 10, 99, 116; Rosin, *Die Ethik des Maimonides*, 12ff.), and even by Bahya Ibn Pakuda, *Duties*, iii. 3; ix. 1, 3, 7; comp. Rosin, 14, although on the whole (see particularly *Duties*, iv. 4, end) he shows a decided tendency toward asceticism. According to Judah Halevi, *Kusari*, ii. 50, the doctrine of the golden mean is the underlying idea of many precepts of the Torah. Abraham Ibn Daud, too, pleads for the middle way in all human actions (*Emunah Ramah*, 98; comp. Rosin, 24), but it was Maimonides, the great systematizer, who in his "Eight Chapters", iv, has treated the subject in its various aspects, making the strict observance of the middle course the central point of Jewish ethics; comp. Rosin 25. As every true idea must be indicated in the Bible and the Talmud we find Maimonides (*l. c.*; comp. also *Hil. Deot*, i. 3-6; *Guide*, II, 39; III, 54) and his faithful followers, as our Palquera and Joseph Kaspi (comp. Steinschneider, in *Ersch und Gruber's Enc.*, sec. II, vol. 31, p. 64, n. 37) endeavoring to interpret scriptural verses and rabbinical dicta in the light of this theory; comp. also Schreiner, *REJ.*, XXII, 69, n. 4. An interesting parallel is found in Tosefta Hagigah 2: מַעֲלִין עַל אָדָם לְהִלָּךְ בְּאַמְצַע וְלֹא יֵהָא נֹמֵה לְכָאן וּלְכָאן; comp. p. Hagigah, ii. 1, near the beginning, and Rosin, 26, n. 1. Among the Arabs, too, the doctrine of the *media via* was known already before the works of Aristotle had reached them; comp. Goldziher, *Kitāb ma'ānī al-nafs*, Berlin 1907, p. 20; *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XVIII, 197. In Honein's Apophthegms (פִּילֹסוֹפִים מֹסְרֵי, ed. Leventhal, 1896), i. 15, one of the thirteen Greek sages who assembled to discuss philosophic topics says: מִה מִזֵּב קִין הַיֹּשֶׁר; comp. *ib.*, ii. 15, No. 23: מִן בְּכָל הַעֲנִינִים וְמִה מְאֹד רַע הַמִּוֹתֵרוֹת בָּהֶם; and Gurland, *פְּנִינֵי הַמִּלְצוֹת*, p. 27, No. 179.

The above quotation from Palquera's *המעלות*, referring to Hullin 58b, where an animal declared מַרְפָּה on the ground of כָּל יֹתֵר כְּנֻסָּה דְּמִי, will give the reader a hint as to the nature of some of these interpretations. See, however, the references given below, note 17.

the feelings and uplifting of the soul; that while the body is not to be despised, it cannot be allowed to rule, but must be kept ever subservient to the mind.¹⁶

This philosophy, set down also in Browning's Rabbi Ben Ezra, was by no means novel even in Palquera's day.

In Talmud and Midrash there are many hints of it.¹⁷ Maimonides had given a long philosophical exposition of the Aristotelian golden mean, and Palquera followed the master here, as elsewhere in the paths of philosophy.¹⁸ There is, however, in Palquera, in spite of his philosophy, an undeniable leaning towards asceticism, and in this respect, he follows more closely the author of the "Duties of the Heart", although he nowhere quotes or mentions Bahya.¹⁹

Indeed, Palquera did not strive to be original either in ethics or metaphysics. The commanding genius of Maimonides deterred from originality. He had settled all problems. Palquera did not aspire to lead forth on new paths, but was content to follow classic models. He was neither discoverer nor pioneer. He set himself to the humble task of inspiring love for learning and zeal for study, for in his view the joy

¹⁶ ואינו מן הנכון להעביר הרוחני הנכבד מפני הגופני השפל . . . וכל מי שנותן יתרון לחלק הגופני על החלק הרוחני אי אפשר שישג התכלית הקצוי (המעלות, 51, ס'). The "final goal" to which he refers in the last two words is the intellectual perfection, the fourth and highest degree of human perfections described by Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 54. The expression התכלית [הקצוי] for the usual השלמות האחרונה is one of the many coinages of new philosophic terms peculiar to Palquera; comp. Zunz, *Ges. Schr.*, III, 277.

¹⁷ Comp. Cassel, on Kusari, II, 50 (2d ed., p. 151); Rosin, *l. c.*, 13, 26; Dukes, *Zur rabbinischen Spruchkunde*, 50.

¹⁸ It should be noted, however, that in spite of his veneration for Maimonides he quite often declares his independence strictly opposing the views of his master; comp. מורה המורה, 99, Steinschneider, *Al Farabi*, 134, and the passages referred to by Venetianer, XI, notes 1 and 2.

¹⁹ Comp. Venetianer, IX, note 5.

of knowledge was the acme of human happiness.²⁰ With whole-hearted simplicity and frankness, he tells us again and again that he is not setting forth original doctrines of his own, but that he is merely bringing together the teachings of the greatest philosophers and scholars,²¹ for the purpose of stirring up the laggard and indifferent, and guiding aright the industrious and the zealous.²² His constant admonitions to study and speculation suggest at times the reproofs and exhortations of the preacher. A life of devotion to the teachings for which he sought to awaken enthusiasm in others is, however, evidence of a harmony of practice and preaching which has unfortunately become rare at times.

All of Palquera's aspirations are summed up in devotion to one idea,—to live a holy life, to purify the will and to perfect character, to surrender one's self to study and contemplation, in order to arrive through this discipline at the ultimate truths of metaphysics, and to attain thereby to that stage of human perfection, in which, according to me-

²⁰ מורה המורה, 9; comp. Steinschneider, *Al-Farabi*, 177, and מורה המורה 132.

²¹ ורוב דברי בו בחכמות הם דברי ראשי הפילוסופים: 9, ראשית חכמה. בקיאתם כי לא חדשים אני מעצמי אלא שקבצתי מהספרים שהם מפורים שם מבקש, *צרי היגון*, ed. Fürth 1854, p. 11; 3a; המעלות, 11, דעות הפילוסופים (unpublished), quoted by Steinschneider, *Cat. Leyden*, 65. Even in this confession his great teacher, Maimonides, seems to have served him as a model, with whose words in the Introduction to the "Eight Chapters" the above passage shows striking resemblance: 'ודע שהדברים אשר אומר בפרקים אלו . . . אינם דברים בודותים מעצמי ולא פרושים שחדשים אמנם הם ענינים לקטנים מדברי חכמים במדרשות ותלמוד . . . ומדברי הפילוסופים ג'ב הקדמונים והחדשים . . . ושמע האמת ממי שאמרו About the last sentence see below, note 31.

²² כדי להעיר הנפש משנת העצלה ולהזהירה תמיד על ההתמדה בלמוד ולרדוף (מעלות, 11). אחר המעלה העליונה שהיא מעלת החכמה

diæval belief, the human spirit became part of the divine spirit, and the finite was merged in the Infinite. This mystical mediæval doctrine was of great significance. Metaphysics, under the influence of this idea was more than the mere search for truth; it was the means of ecstatic union with the Godhead. Ethics thus became secondary to metaphysics. Religious observances, for Palquera as for Maimonides, ceased to have an absolute value in and for themselves: they formed a discipline for the soul, calculated to restrain the animal instincts and passions, in order that the pure spirit or intellect in man might not be hampered in its striving after self-realization and union with God. We can now understand more readily Palquera's passion for study and speculation, and his zeal to spread knowledge and to stimulate intellectual activity.

A comprehension of the highest metaphysical truth was absolutely essential to a deeper and purer faith,—we might well nigh say, to salvation. Naturally Palquera was confronted with the problem out of which had sprung the entire philosophical movement among the Jews in the Middle Ages—namely, the reconciliation of Judaism with Greek philosophy, a segment of the larger problem, the relation of revealed religion to science and rational thought. This question was by no means a mere academic debate in Palquera's day. A party of zealots²³ frowned upon the study of Greek philosophy as incompatible with piety and destructive of faith. Palquera was convinced that the mediæval philosophy, current among Jews, Christians, and Moham-

²³ In his Introduction to *מורה המורה*, beginning, Palquera refers to them as *רבים מחכמי תורתנו*; see his Epistle in the defense of Maimonides, printed at the end of *מנחת קנאות* of Abba Mari, Pressburg 1838 (also in *קובץ תשובות הרמב"ם*, 1859, III, 23ff.), and the following notes.

medans, was in no way in conflict with the doctrines of Judaism; that the religion divinely revealed to Israel could not contain anything contrary to the conclusions of clear thinking. This proposition had been laid down by one of the Geonim²⁴ as early as the tenth century, and Maimonides had set himself to the task of giving it philosophical demonstration.

The assumption of the identity of the dicta of revelation with the doctrines of philosophy had important consequences. Palquera held it to be an unavoidable religious obligation to interpret Biblical texts in a way that would reconcile the conflicts between the Bible and the philosophers, that is, between reason and religion. This was what the older Jewish philosophers, and notably Maimonides, had done. The procedure naturally involved rationalism, and some of the disciples of Maimonides carried their rationalism to the utmost. They made of the Bible a textbook of science and metaphysics, written in a symbolic style. They held, for example, that Abraham and Sarah, of the biblical story, were to be understood as emblematic of matter and spirit. They declared that the twelve sons of Jacob stand for the twelve signs of the zodiac, and the Urim and the Thummim on the breast-plate of the high-priest were an astrolabe.²⁵ It was this extreme rationalistic procedure that had aroused the ire of conservatives and led them to denounce the study of philosophy.

²⁴ Namely the Gaon Samuel ben Hofni, father-in-law of Hai Gaon; comp. Steinschneider, *JQR.*, XVII., 357. Judah Halevi, *Kusari*, I, 67, expresses the same opinion: חלילה לאל שתבא התורה במה שירדה ראיה או מופת, "far be it from God that the Torah should come in a way that would be a sign or evidence"; comp. Bacher, *Die Bibelepexese der jüd. Religionsphilosophen*, 108, n. 2.

²⁵ For more particulars see Kaufmann's article in Zunz' *Jubelschrift*, 143 f., and *Die Sinne*, Leipzig 1884, 19f.

While Palquera himself did not go to extremes in his rationalism, he shows some traces of the same tendency. In this conflict he came forward energetically to defend the cause of the philosophers.²⁶ He attributes the hostility toward philosophy to ignorance, and holds that the ban on metaphysics could come only from the ignorant.²⁷ Already in his dialogue²⁸ between a pietist and a philosopher, on the permissibility of philosophic study, which was written in his earlier years, he is at pains to defend the study of philosophy and in the end brings the pietist over to the side of the philosopher and metaphysician, convincing him that the study of philosophy was not only permissible but essential to true religion.

To explain the presumed harmony existing between the teachings revealed in the Bible and the doctrines taught by pagan philosophy, an ingenious theory had been developed. In substance it was as follows: The wisdom of the Greeks and of other nations had their source among the Jews. The original works were lost in the Exile, but through transla-

²⁶ See his Epistle referred to above, n. 23.

²⁷ מזה הספר יתבאר באור אמתו אם אנו רשאים ללמוד אלו החכמות מצד תורתנו אם לא או אם סותרים דבר ממה שנזכר בתורתנו כמו שיחשוב מי שאין לו שכל מפני שיש אנשים חסרי דעת תועים בנפשם וחושבים כי הוא אסור מצד התורה לעיין באלו החכמות וזה הטעות הראה (ס' המעלות 73, line 21) read קרה as in המעלות להם מפני שהם סכלים באלו החכמות ואלו ידעו אמתתם היו יודעים כי הדבר הפך ממה שחשבו ולא כאשר יחשבו חסרי לב כי הפילוסופיה שהיא (ראשית חכמה) 21; comp. *JQR.*, XVII, 367, note). Similarly he expresses himself in המעלות, 48: חכמה המופתית סותרת תורתנו חלילה שתהיה סותרת האמת אבל המודיעה אותה ... הטפש חשב כי (see above note 24); comp. also המעלות 73: המעיין בפילוסופיא נוטה מדרך תורתנו הקדושה עד שחשבו במחשבותיהם הרקות מהאמת כי כל דבר שהוא נזכר בפילוסופיא הוא שוא ושקר אפילו שיש על אותו דבר דעות הפילוסופים; מורה המורה beginning; *Cat. Leyden*, 63.

²⁸ 3d edition by Jellinek, Vienna 1875; comp. Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, II, 204; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, XV, 41; XVI, 91.

tions, the ideas contained in them were transmitted first to the Chaldeans and Persians, and subsequently to the Greeks and Romans. In its essential points, this notion is current among the Jews of Alexandria as early as the second century B. C. (being found in Aristobule of Paneas, an author quoted by Josephus and Eusebius). Pythagoras, it was supposed, had studied under King Solomon; or, according to others, he was the disciple of the prophet Ezekiel. Socrates derived his philosophy from Ahithophel and from Asaph the Psalmist; Plato was the pupil of Jeremiah, and Aristotle studied under Simon the Just. This view, so flattering to the pride of the Jews, was entertained also by the Arabs and the Christians.²⁹

Naturally, the Jews were particularly interested in the general acceptance of this view. The theory afforded the least humiliating apology for the absence of scientific works in Hebrew. It gave the Jews, devoted to scientific pursuits, the proud consciousness that even though they were studying science in a foreign language, they were still cultivating their own vineyard. To Palquera, thirsting for knowledge,

²⁹ There is a considerable literature on this point, a detailed discussion of which is, however, not within the scope of this essay. I refer the reader to Steinschneider's *Jewish Literature*, 275, n. 25, where, however, the statement about Roger Bacon's opposition to this view (repeated also in the article "Joseph Caspi", *Ersch und Gruber's Enc.*, sect. 2, vol. 31, p. 72, n. 74) is erroneous (see the passages from Bacon's works, quoted by Guttman, *Monatsschrift*, 1896, p. 324); comp. also Steinschneider, *Pseud-epigraphische Literatur*, 47, 80; *Hebr. Übers.*, p. xvi; Munk, *Guide*, I, 332, n. 3; Venetianer, *l. c.*, xii; Zimmels, *Leo Hebraeus*, 58; particularly Kaufmann, *Die Sinne*, 5ff., and *Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*, 14. To the numerous sources mentioned there may be added the anonymus author of the *Kitāb ma'ānī al-naḥs*, edited by Goldziher, Berlin 1907, p. 43; Hebrew translation, תורות הנפש, by Broyde, Paris 1896, p. 57 (comp. Guttman, *Monatsschrift*, 1897, p. 241ff) and David Nieto, מטה דן, fourth וכוז, No. 6f. Some information will be found also in my article ארסטוטליס in the Hebrew Enc. אוצר ישראל, 216, with which comp. Jellinek on הוכוח, 19, notes 3-5.

and eager to accept it, whether it appeared in a Jewish or in a non-Jewish garb, this doctrine was naturally no less welcome than to Judah Halevi (*Kusari*, II, 66) and Maimonides (*Guide*, I, 71). The Bible describes Solomon as the "wisest of men" and tells how all the nations of the earth flocked to hear his wisdom. It reports that he discoursed on the cedars of the Lebanon, the beasts of the field, and the fishes of the sea. By the play of mediæval fancy, King Solomon was made professor of natural science, theology, and metaphysics, whose works, subsequently lost to the Jews in exilic times, were translated by his foreign students into their own languages.³⁰ Hence, Palquera argued, it is a sacred duty to restore the treasures of science, of which Judaism had been despoiled, by the zealous study of the foreign literature, and the propagation thereof on its original soil. He took this task upon himself with enthusiasm; he denounced those who opposed the study of the wisdom of the Gentiles, as ignorant and blind. Losing his philosophical calm, he exclaims, "These fools know not that truth is to be accepted from every man. Its touch-stone is not the rank or position of its professor, but its intrinsic worth".³¹

³⁰ המעלות, 12; מורה המורה, 7; comp. S. Sachs, התחיה, 14; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 743.

³¹ ורבים מעמי הארץ אשר מחכמה רקים ודלים יקשה מאוד בעיניהם כשיביא המחבר ראיה מדברי חכמי האומות ודבריהם בעיניהם דברים בטלים ואומרים כי אין ראוי לקבלם ולא יזכרו ולא יפקרו ולא יעלו על לב לעולם. ולא יבינו אלה הפתאים חסרי הלב כי ראוי לקבל האמת מכל אדם אפילו שיהיה פחות ממנו או מעט אחר ואם יכתוב דבר ממה שאמר בשמו יכתבנו. ואין ראוי להביט אל האומר אלא על (sic) ("Book of the Degrees", 11, quoted also by Jellinek, *l. c.*, 19). Very characteristic in this connection is Palquera's remark in *אגרת הוֹכּוּחַ*, 3, where he makes the philosopher say to the pietist: זאדם חייב ללמוד עד מקום שידרו מגעת מהאומרים האמת אף שהם כופרים כמו שיוקח הרבש מן הדבורים; and another in the "B. of the D.", 75:

He acted accordingly, and explored the realm of Græco-Arabic philosophy. His incursion into this field was well rewarded: his pages bristle with citations of Plato, Aristotle, and the lesser lights of mediæval philosophy which with scrupulous conscientiousness, rare in mediæval writers, he credits to the authors.³² In the "Book of Degrees" alone, more than a hundred citations of Greek and Arabic thinkers appear. His success in popularizing Greek and Arabic thought among the Jews merits for him a high place in the temple of mediæval Jewish learning.³³

ולא הבינו אלו החסרים כי החכמות כר האומות משתתפות בהם ואינם מיוחדות לאומה וידועה, both of which show that the gospel of liberality and broad-mindedness was not first discovered by the "prophets" of the twentieth century. Comp. also the quotation from his unpublished דעות הפילוסופים in Steinschneider's *Catal. Leyden*, 63, Zunz, *Hebr. Bibl.*, IX, 136, and אגרת הוכוח, 13. The meaning of the sentence דע האמת ותדע בעליה "Learn the truth and then consider him from whom it proceeds" becomes clear from the context, being quoted as a corroboration of the doctrine that truth is not to be judged by its propounders but by its intrinsic value. The expression ותדע, however, does not clearly convey this idea. The sentence is attributed by Gazzali to the Caliph 'Ali, comp. Schmoelders, *Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes*, Paris 1842, p. 39. In Gazzali's *Ethics*, מאוני צדק, 166, the same sentence is quoted anonymously in a somewhat amplified form: אמר חכם לא ידע האמת באנשים דע האמת ותדע אנשיו. Comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, XV, 44. The same idea is expressed by Maimonides, Introduction to the "Eight Chapters": ושמע האמת ממי שאמרו (see above, end of note 21); comp. משלי חכמים, in יהודה אבן תבון, ed. Steinschneider, Berlin 1852, p. 21, No. 69. Joseph Kaspi in his Testament (in טעם זקנים, Frankf. a. M. 1854, p. 53) has the same sentence in mind when he admonishes his son: אל תביטו אל אומר הדברים, and then by a clever witticism refers it to himself taking the verse קחו מוסרי ואל כסף (Prov. 8, 10) as an allusion to his name, that is to say: heed my moral instruction and do not mind its coming from Kaspi.

... כתבתי כל דבר בשם אומרו ומי שהוא מפורסם אצל הכל זכרתי שמו ומי ... שאינו מפורסם אמרתי בעדו ותפלוסוף אומר ... B. of the D., 12; s. Steinschneider, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, l. c.; Maimonides, Introduction to "Eight Chapters".

³³ Comp. Güdemann, *Das jüd. Unterrichtswesen*, Vienna 1873, 155 f.

What a contrast between the liberal spirit of Palquera and the narrow attitude of the church of his time! While he was advocating the study of the literature of the Gentiles, the church vigorously forbade all intercourse with the Jews, lest its adherents might learn from the Jews aught that would undermine their faith; and an ecclesiastical council at Beziers, in 1246, forbade Christians to call in Jewish physicians.

Palquera's extraordinary command of the works of Arabic authors, his extensive and thorough knowledge of every branch of Jewish learning, sacred and profane, warrant his reputation as the most learned Jewish author of his time. Graetz (*Gesch.*, VII, 216), by no means disposed to overestimate his merits, as is evident by his curt dismissal of him with scarce a page, describes Palquera as "a living encyclopædia of the sciences of his day, trustworthy on any topic on which information may be required".

Palquera was moreover blessed with facility of expression. He was eager to impart his encyclopædic knowledge. A command of a clear style and forceful exposition made the results of his study widely accessible in Jewry. In a democratic spirit, he sought to make his knowledge popular, and rejected Arabic, the literary language of his day, for Hebrew—the tongue better understood by the masses.⁸⁴

Seventeen works,⁸⁵ some of small, others of larger size, attest to his prolific literary career. Three of these have

⁸⁴ המעלות) והיתה הכונה להכירו בלה"ק כדי שתהיה תועלתו כוללת יותר 11; the same in מורה המורה, 8). In ראשית חכמה, 21, he also says: כונתי לחבר מאלו החכמות בלשוננו כי טוב הוא שנלמוד אותם בלשוננו משנלמוד בלשון אחר; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 5.

⁸⁵ I include in this number also the fragments of a Hebrew work, which contained extracts from Pseudo-Empedocles' "Five Substances", under the

unfortunately been lost³⁶; five are accessible only in manu-

title **ס' העצמים החמשה**, translated from the Arabic original which no longer exists. The fragments were published in the posthumous work of David Kaufmann, *Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*, pp. 17ff., Budapest 1899. Kaufmann (pp. 59-63) proves by the style of the Fragments the authorship of Palquera. They are, moreover, quoted directly in the name of P. by Johanan Alemanno, an author of the 15th century, who, according to Kaufm. (p. 15), was in possession of the whole book; comp. also Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 380, note 86. To the 17 works is in all probability to be added the Epistle in the defense of Maimonides' *Guide*, appended to the **מנחת קנאות** of Abba Mari, Pressburg 1838, though the Epistle does not bear P's name (comp. *JQR.*, XVII, 367, note), and several liturgical pieces enumerated by Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 481, for which Gabirol's hymns served P. as a model. In a manuscript containing the Hebrew translation of Averroes' Compendium of the Metaphysics of Aristotle by Moses Ibn Tibbon (1258) mention is often made and variants quoted from a Hebrew translation of the same work by Palquera. It is possible, however, that these quotations have reference to the numerous extracts from Averroes, found in Palquera's Commentary on the Guide and in his other works (Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 5, note 31b; 159, note 374), Benjacob, *Thesaurus*, p. 282, No. 186, mentions also (following Ghirondi) a "Treatise on the 13 articles of Faith" and a **ס' המהלכות** (p. 305, No. 696), of which I did not find any trace elsewhere. The **קצור ס' המדות לארסטו** (Benj., p. 533, No. 480) is, perhaps, a confusion with Palquera's **ראשית חכמה** where (p. 17 ff., comp. also **מבקש**, 21 ff.) an ethical epistle ascribed to Aristotle is inserted (comp. Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 356). The mentioning of a work **תועלת לאברים** (Benjacob, p. 628, No. 216) is based upon a misunderstanding of the passage quoted there from the **מבקש** (see the next note). The work is identical with **אגרת**, Benjacob, p. 10, No. 194 (comp. below, note 37). One more work of P. is, perhaps, **וכוח הוקנים עם הצעירים**, in Cod. Vat. 298; comp. Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 378. Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.*, III, 62, ascribes it, as also the **ראשית חכמה** (!), to P's father, Joseph; comp. *Literaturblatt des Orients*, VI, 148.

³⁶ They are (1) Commentary on the Bible mentioned in **מורה המורה** 6, comp. pp. 144, 145, where he refers to his Commentary on Proverbs. (2) An exposition of haggadic passages of the Talmud, under the title **ס' הדרש**, mentioned in **מורה המורה**, 114. (3) **מגלת הזכרון**, a historical account of the sufferings of the Jewish nation mentioned in the **מבקש**, 2b; comp. below p. 17; and Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 5. In the last mentioned passage Palquera enumerates all the works he wrote prior to the **מבקש**. There is, however, much doubt as to the exact number of books his list contains, owing to the ambiguity of the titles. For clearness' sake we must quote the beginning of that passage verbatim: **חברתי הלכות חולין והנהגת הבריות והנהגת הנפש אשר** According to M. Strashun

script;³⁷ nine have been printed. It would be impossible to enter here upon a lengthy discussion of the character and content of Palquera's writings. Suffice it is to say that his chief concern was with philosophy. Three works in this field were devoted to a compendium of the science and metaphysics known in his day.³⁸ Here the physics and metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle, as expounded by Aristotle's

(see below, note 53) the word חולין means *sick* (= חולים), and the whole passage has reference to the work mentioned below, note 37, No. 1. Dukes, *Zur Kenntniss der Neuhebr. Religiösen Poesie*, Frankf. a. M. 1842, p. 142, on the other hand, takes הלכות חולין as a separate work containing a versification of the talmudic tractate Hullin. Moses Ibn Habib of Lisbon (15th century) reports to have seen it, but forgot the name of the author. Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 170, follows Dukes; comp., however, his *Bodl. Cat.*, col. 2538: "attamen de hoc dubitari protest." Indeed, it is more probable that the whole passage refers to his "Dietetics" (note 37), the real title of which he amplified for the sake of the rhyme. M. David, *Introd. to ראשית חכמה*, VII, not realizing this, takes הלכות חולין as part of the real title and proposes an emendation in P.'s text of a very doubtful value.

³⁷ (1) אגרת (בתי) הנהגת הגוף והנפש (1), "Treatise (Verses) on the Proper Conduct of Body and Soul", in several manuscripts; comp. Benjacob, *s. v.*, and Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.*, col. 2538. (2) אגרת המוסר, "Treatise on Ethics" (see מבקש, *l. c.*), the introductory part of which was published by Steinschneider in *Letterbode*, 1879, p. 79f.; comp. also *idem* in *Letterbode*, XII, 67, n. 36; *Hebr. Übers.*, 5, n. 31. (3) שלמות המעשים, likewise on ethics; see Munk, *Mélanges* etc., 495, overlooked by David, *l. c.* (4) אגרת החלום, "Treatise of the Dream". This title has misled the bibliographers (even Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 371, n. 78) to believe that the book contains an exposition on the nature of dreams. Its content, however, is again ethics, and the title is due to a dream of the author, which led him to the composition of the work, as will be shown in connection with its publication, which is being prepared by the writer for a subsequent number of this REVIEW. (5) דעות הפילוסופים, a voluminous work, for the detailed characterization of which see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, § 2.

³⁸ (1) ראשית חכמה, recently published with a German introduction of little value by M. David, Berlin 1902. The edition is rather uncritical, the editor, in most cases, having placed into the text the least correct readings. The work has been translated into Latin by an anonymous author (MS. Paris, 6691); comp. Munk, *Mélanges*, 495. Pages 72-78 in David's edition, con-

foremost commentator, Averroes, were presented anew in a systematic, yet popular, garb. Palquera, as already noted, was at one with Maimonides and the other mediæval Jewish philosophers in their devotion to the dominant Aristotelian system. As evidence of the breadth of his interests, Palquera has left us also a compendium on mediæval psychology,³⁹ and a work entitled "Diætic of Body and Soul".⁴⁰ To these is to be added the above-mentioned defense of philosophy against its opponents,⁴¹ and "The Book of Degrees", a systematic exposition of ethics in which he deals with the various degrees of human perfection according to men's moral and intellectual qualities. It ranks, after the works of Gabirol and Bahya, among the early attempts at a systematic presentation of ethics.⁴²

taining a brief presentation of the philosophy of Plato, were published with a literal German translation and a minute description of the whole work by Steinschneider, *Al-Farabi*, 176 ff., 224 ff. (unknown to David); comp. also *Hebr. Übers.*, § 12. (2) **מבקש**, Hague 1779, Aleppo 1867, Josefoff 1881; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, l. c. Michael Sachs, *Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, Berlin 1845, pp. 345-6, gave a masterly German imitation in rhymed prose of a portion of this work, pp. 24b, 25a. (3) **דעות הפילוסופים**, see above, note 37, No. 5.

³⁹ **ספר הנפש**, Lemberg 1835, and, with a very extensive commentary by Israel Hayyim Klein, Warsaw 1864; comp. the references given by David, p. ix, n. 16.

⁴⁰ See above, note 37, No. 1.

⁴¹ See above, note 28. This work, too, was translated into Latin by an anonymous author; comp. Munk, *Mélanges*, 495, No. 4, end; see above, note 38.

⁴² See above, note 3, end. Part of this work was translated into Latin by Buxtorf (fil.); see Steinschneider, "Christliche Hebraisten" in *ZfHB.*, I-V, No. 125; comp. also Dukes, *Zur rabb. Spruchkunde*, 75ff. The publication of the **ספר המעלות** had been undertaken by Zunz in 1818, who intended also to translate it into Latin (see his *Ges. Schr.*, I, 29), but only the beginning was published in the periodical **הלבנון**, IV, 6, 19. To the class of ethical works belongs also his **צרי היגיון** (quoted in **מבקש**, 2b), written in rhymed prose, interspersed with metrical verses. It was first published by Saul b. Simon (Cremona 1557), who in his Introduction asserts that

Two other of Palquera's works merit special attention. The first of these is his "Fountain of Life"⁴³. Through this work Palquera saved to Judaism the credit for its most original contribution to philosophy. The most striking philosophical system, which mediæval Judaism produced, was attributed throughout the Middle Ages and up to recent times to an unknown Avicebron, or Albenzubrun. Christians and Arabs alike claimed him as their own. In 1846, the great Jewish orientalist, Solomon Munk, startled the scholarly world by the announcement that the mysterious Avicebron was no other than the famous Jewish poet Solomon Ibn Gabirol. This discovery was due ultimately to Palquera. Gabirol's system was felt to be out of touch with Judaism. It had aroused the antagonism of no less notable a thinker than Abraham Ibn Daud, whose hostility served to suppress Gabirol's book. Palquera, however, had recognized the merit of Gabirol's philosophy and sought to win for it wider recognition. He accordingly translated it from Arabic into Hebrew, and epitomized it under the title "Fountain of Life". It was left for Munk to show the identity of this work with the famous mediæval *Fons Vitæ*, attributed to Avicebron.

The second of these notable works of Palquera

he lost the original manuscript and had to reproduce its contents from memory. He, moreover, claims to have added about two thirds to the content of the book; comp. *Her. Bibl.*, IX, 49. The original manuscript is extant, however, in the collection of the late David Kaufmann, see Max Weisz, *Katalog der hebr. Handschr. und Bücher in der Bibl. des Prof. D. Kaufmann*, Frankf. a. M. 1906, p. 171. M. David, p. vii, counts this work among those lost. D. Ottensosser published the צרי היגון with a German translation, Fürth 1854.

⁴³ לקוטים מן ספר מקור חיים, edited by Munk with a French translation and notes in his famous work *Mélanges* etc., Paris 1859.

is his commentary⁴⁴ on Maimonides' "Guide of the Perplexed". This reveals Palquera's wide and deep erudition. To elucidate the Maimonidean text, he cites numerous parallel passages from the kindred Arabic literature of which he was master. Later authors often drew upon his commentary and won repute for scholarship at the expense of Palquera. In an appendix to this commentary he gives an excellent criticism of Ibn Tibbon's translation, comparing it with the original, and pointing out its defects. Franz Delitzsch valued this chapter so highly that he published an annotated translation of it in German.⁴⁵ Munk, in his French edition of Maimonides' *Guide*, makes frequent use of Palquera's commentary.

In an age absorbed in religious discussion and biblical study, it is to be expected that Palquera should have written on biblical exegesis. Unfortunately, however, his work in this field has been lost.⁴⁶ The presumable cause for this fate of his Bible commentary is not without interest. We have had occasion to note the rationalistic tendency in Bible exposition, manifest in Palquera's extant works, and his defense of philosophy against the attacks hurled at it in his day. There is ground for suspecting that this commentary was suppressed. Abrabanel's denunciation of the author as a member of the "damnable sect" of misinterpreters of the Bible⁴⁷ served to deter pious readers from

⁴⁴ Under the title *מורה המורה*, Pressburg 1837.

⁴⁵ *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1840, p. 177ff.; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 423.

⁴⁶ See above, note 36, No. 1.

⁴⁷ Comp. Steinschneider, *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judent.*, XVI, 153. Our assumption regarding the causes that brought about the loss of Palquera's exegetical works finds strong support in the fact that Abrabanel's denunciation of the exegetical writings of Joseph Kaspi, whom, in the same passage of his *מפעילות אלהים*, he counts together with Palquera

this work, and thus to consign his commentary to oblivion. His radical and rationalistic interpretation of haggadic passages in the Talmud probably accounts for a similar fate which befell another of his works on talmudic Haggadah.⁴⁸

Palquera embraced in the wide sweep of his activity a branch of learning little appreciated by the Jews of his time, namely, history. He wrote a chronicle of events of his own century, and probably also of earlier centuries.⁴⁹ Considering the paucity of historic documents, such a work would be invaluable to the modern historian. Contemporary indifference, however, allowed this chronicle to be lost.

A sketch of Palquera would not be complete without at least a passing reference to his work as a poet. From early youth, Palquera was devoted to the muse, and in his later life, he struggled almost pathetically against his poetic inclinations. He confesses to the youthful folly of having composed, in his early years, more than 20,000 lines of verse, only about a half of which he wrote down.⁵⁰ In all

among the misinterpreters of the Bible, has led to the suppression of Kaspi's works in the centuries that followed; comp. Steinschneider in *Ersch und Gruber's Enc.*, sect. 2, vol. 31, p. 73; comp. the instance of Ibn Gabirol and Ibn Daud mentioned above, p. 174.

⁴⁸ See above, note 36, No. 2.

⁴⁹ See above, note 36, No. 3.

⁵⁰ ובתי השיר למעלה מרבאתים רבו וכרבווא מהם נכתבו כי רובם אבדו שהיו להכתב ראויים. In this work, written for the most part in rhymed verse, when nearly forty years of age (see *ib.*, beginning), he bids a touching farewell to his muse. He regrets the hours wasted in his youth in writing verse, hours which he might have spent more profitably in the pursuit of knowledge and search for truth. He vows solemnly to live henceforth for science alone:

אמרתי אל נפשי לגרש השירה ולשלח ולהיות דינה כדין שעיר המשתלח ולשוב בלב טהור לאל נושא עון וחטא סולה ואדור נדר לבל אעמוד עוד בסודה וכתבתי לה זה ספר כריתות ואתן בידה :

his extant works, we find various poems and epigrams, some of which we have had occasion to quote earlier in this essay.⁵¹

Akin to his poetical skill is his facility for rhymed prose, a literary device borrowed from the Arabs and much in vogue among Jewish writers of the thirteenth and fourteenth century. His clever conceits and witty puns easily rank among the best of their kind.

Whatever we may think of Palquera's poetic talents, we cannot deny him literary skill of a high order. With earnestness, there is associated in Palquera a power of expression, adequate to the author's thought and feeling, capable of clarifying the most abstruse ideas of mediæval phi-

בנות השיר מעלי פני אשלח
ואגרתי תהי ספר כריתות
ובת חכמה אארש לי לאשה
ואקנה בת תבונה לי צמיתות.

(The word *אגרתי* refers to the *מבקש*, which he divides into two distinct parts (*אגרות*), the first of which is written in rhyme, the second in plain prose.)

His last poem (on p. 28*b*) he introduces with the following words: *ואלה דברי שיר האחרונים ומהיום הזה והלאה אין לי חלק בשירות ולא נחלה בזמירות*; comp. M. Sachs, *l. c.*, 346. To consider the occupation with poetry a sinful waste of time is not a rare occurrence among mediæval poets, and their assertions are not to be taken seriously (see David, vi, n. 5). Judah Halevi is reported to have repented before his death, as did also Plato, his former devotion to the art of poetry; comp. Cassel on *Kusari*, II, 73. The same is said of Moses Rieti, the so-called Hebrew Dante; see Steinschneider, *Letteratura Italiana dei Giudei*, Rome 1884, p. 49.

⁵¹ The following four epigrams (*מבקש*, 2*b*, 17*b*, 26*b*) in the translation of Rabbi Ettelson may be added here:

1.

Adapt thyself to time and circumstance,
So wilt thou be untroubled every way;
Amongst the wise make wise thy countenance,
And with the fool, the rôle of dullard play;
Roar, if upon a lion thou shouldst chance,
But if an ass thou meetest, simply bray!

losophy. There is a peculiar charm and a strong personal appeal in nearly everything that Palquera wrote.⁵² His works breathe sincerity and enthusiasm. The reader feels that with Palquera, authorship is not dilletanteism; it is a sacred life's mission dedicated to the service of truth and knowledge.

In conclusion, a word on Palquera's influence on his contemporaries and on later generations. A final verdict is not safe at the present stage of historical and bibliographical research. However, if we bear in mind how many works of notable authors of the thirteenth century have

2.

Seek wisdom, understand the times and seasons;
Acquire judgment to weigh well all reasons;
Pursue this quest, tho' you be old and tho'
Your path's beset with hosts of cares and treasons.

3.

If sin thou wouldst avoid, then speak but once,
For the Creator gave thee just *one* mouth,
And listen twice,—thus speech with silence, season!
But gave thee *two* ears for that very reason!

4.

Reproof will not amend the brazen,—no,
Not even if thou pleadest, day and night.
Ply not with rod the fool's back, for not so
Canst thou his nature's warping set aright.
The rather pound him on the head, for there
His "imp of the perverse" hath fitting lair.

The third epigram is the rhymed adaptation of a sentence in מוסרי וראה אפלאטון איש הפילוסופים, II, 2, No. 17, where it is ascribed to Plato: מרבה לדבר וממעט לשמוע ויאמר לו פרע חוב אזניך מפיו כי הבורא ית' יצר לנו שתי אזנים ולשון אחת כדי שנשמע כפל מה שנדבר; comp. Kaufmann, *Die Sinne*, 138. Steinschneider, *Manna*, 84, translated this epigram, among others of Palquera, metrically into German.

⁵² Güdemann, *Das jüd. Unterrichtswesen*, 157, strange to say, designates Palquera's style as "dry" and monotonous! Comp. to the contrary Kaufmann, *Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*, 59, 61.

been lost, the preservation of so many of Palquera's writings is evidence of the high regard in which he was held by his own and by succeeding generations. That some of these works should be preserved in eight or even ten manuscripts, is proof of no slight popularity. Citations from Palquera's works are frequent, although credit is not often given to the author.⁵³ Mediæval scholastics thought his works on

⁵³ "The abundance of quotations (from Arabic sources in Palquera's Commentary on the *Guide* of Maimonides) was sufficient to give to those who plagiarized him the appearance of great learning" (Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 422). Some of those who made use of Palquera's works may be mentioned here in chronological order:

MOSES DE LEON (13th century); see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 243, n. 975.

ISAAC IBN LATIF (1280); see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, p. 23, n. 150.

JOSEPH KASPI, who lived not long after Palquera, based his commentaries on the *Guide* of Maimonides (edited by Raphael Kirchheim, Frankf. a. M. 1848) on Palquera's commentary on the same work, and copied whole chapters from it, often mentioning also his source; see about the relation of Kaspi's works to those of Palquera Kirchheim's Introduction to the work mentioned, and Steinschneider's article, *Joseph Caspi*," in *Ersch und Gruber's Enc.*, sect. 2, vol. 31, p. 67.

ELHANAN BEN ABRAHAM (14th century); see Kaufmann, *Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*, 13.

GERSHON BEN SOLOMON (14th century), in his encyclopædic work *שער השמים*, third edition by Heidenheim, Rödelheim 1801; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 9.

JUDAH LEON MOSCONI (14th century), suggested by Steinschneider, *Magazin f. d. W. d. Jud.* III, 193.

SAMUEL ZARZA (1370), in his super-commentary on Abraham Ibn Ezra; see M. Straschun in *פרחי צפון*, edited by S. J. Fünß, Wilna 1841, I, 48, n. 11. In his unpublished *מכלל יופי* Zarza quotes Palquera directly; see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, IX, 49.

SOLOMON BEN MENAHEM, called PRAT MAIMON (1420), in his commentary on the *Kusari*; see Ventianer, *l. c.*, XV, n. 4.

JOSEPH BEN SHEM-TOB (1455); see Steinschneider, in *Ersch und Gruber's Enc.*, sect. 2, vol. 31, p. 88, n. 4.

MOSES MINZ (15th century); see M. Straschun, *l. c.*

JOHANAN ALEMANNO (ob. 1500); see above, note 35; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, p. 5, n. 36.

philosophy worthy of translation into Latin,⁵⁴ and later Hebrew scholars have deemed them deserving of commentaries.⁵⁵ Since the age of the printing press, some of his works have passed through several editions.⁵⁶ Even for modern students, Palquera has not been devoid of interest; witness several scholarly editions of some of his works. Thus Palquera has received some of the recognition merited by his sincere and life-long devotion to the pursuit of truth.

* * *

More than six hundred years have passed away since the days of Shem Tob Palquera, a scholar of the highest type, an enthusiastic champion of learning and enlightenment. His life and activity are the embodiment of the philosophic romanticism of the Jews in the Middle Ages. In him we see a man of the most exalted sentiments, whose striving after moral and spiritual perfection, and courageous and self-sacrificing devotion to the fostering of intellectual life among his brethren, served to break through the barriers which the dark age of ecclesiastical bigotry sought

ISAAC ABRABANEL (*ob.* 1508) quotes him frequently; see above, note 47; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, p. 7, n. 47.

ABRAHAM BEN DAVID PROVENÇALI, who, in 1555, copied in Modena Palquera's *מורה המורה*, and, in 1593, in Venice, the latter's Introduction to *ראשית חכמה*: see Zunz, in *Keren Chemed*, V, 157.

SAUL BEN SIMON (1557), who edited the *צרי היגון*: see above note 42.

SOLOMON FINZI (1600): see Zunz, *Hebr. Bibl.*, IX, 137.

JOSEPH SOLOMON DEL MEDIGO (*ob.* 1655); see Strascun, *l. c.*

ELHANAN HAEHNDEL KIRCHHAHN (1707), in his *Judaeo-German שפת הנפש* (see Grünbaum, *Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie*, 238 ff), Rödelheim 1752, pp. 9, 12; see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, IX, 49, n. 7.

⁵⁴ See above, notes 38, 41, 42.

⁵⁵ See above, note 39.

⁵⁶ So the *ספר הנפש* (3 edd.), *אגרת הובות* (3 edd.), *צרי היגון* (4 edd.), *מבקש* (3 edd.), (2 edd.).

to impose on Jewry. The problems which occupied Palquera are no longer our problems, and the solutions advanced by him cannot meet present requirements. The spirit, however, which animated his career, is the spirit that animates us to-day: the spirit searching for the permanent amid the transitory, for progress and light. With a feeling of appreciation and reverence toward Palquera, we may say with the poet:

"Wer den Besten seiner Zeit genug gethan, der hat gelebt für alle Zeiten."

JEWISH-ARABIC STUDIES*

BY ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER,

Jewish Theological Seminary of America

EVER since young Abraham Geiger, stimulated by a prize offer of the University of Bonn, first undertook to answer the question: "What did Muhammed adopt from Judaism?"¹—the inquiry into the relation between Judaism and Islam, by which a long and glorious period in our history is characterized, has occupied a prominent position in modern Jewish research. The subject is, indeed, one of unique fascination. For the relation between Judaism and her younger daughter has been on the whole, despite numerous misunderstandings and disagreements, one of mutual helpfulness and co-operation and free from that jealousy and hostility, marking and marring the contact of Judaism with other religions and cultures, which only knows of domination or subjection and makes the triumph of the one depend on the downfall of the other. The relation between Judaism and Islam is of such particular attraction to the student, because, like every other healthy relation, be it between individuals or communities, it is based on reciproc-

* Dedicated to Professor Ignaz Goldziher, the master in the field of Jewish-Arabic studies, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, June 22, 1910. [The publication of this article has been delayed owing to typographical difficulties.—EDITORS.]

¹ *Was hat Muhammed aus dem Judentume aufgenommen? Ein von der Königl. Preussischen Rheinuniversität gekrönte Preisschrift.* Bonn 1833. The second edition (Leipzig 1902) is an unaltered reprint of the first,—a strange anachronism after 75 years of uninterrupted research!

ity; because it does not consist of mere giving or taking, but is permeated by the principle: *do ut des*. While in its formative period, during the lifetime of Muhammed and, to a much larger extent than generally supposed, in the time after Muhammed,² Islam freely borrows from the parent religion the elements it needs for its up-building and development, it becomes, in turn, after its consolidation, the giver, infusing new life into time-worn Judaism and stimulating it to new efforts and ventures. Neither the investigator of Islam, who endeavors to detect its component parts and primary forces, nor the student of Judaism who traces the influences emanating from it and the elements penetrating into it, can afford to disregard this correlation which has left so profound an impress on the mental development of either religion. As for Jewish scholarship, it can readily point to numerous, more or less systematic, endeavors in this direction, beginning with the first attempt of Geiger down to our own time. A very considerable portion of the stupendous activity of the late Steinschneider was devoted to this task, and among the living it is first and foremost Goldziher who brings his unequalled mastery over the combined dominions of Islam and Judaism to bear upon the study of their mutual relations and, like the hoopoe in the Muhammedan legend, is able to penetrate into depths which are hidden from the gaze of the ordinary student. Yet the field is immeasurable, and unlimited room is left to those of the *minorum gentium* who, conscious of their limitations, yet have the earnest desire of adding their mite to the elucidation of these fascinating problems. In the following the writer begs to submit his contribution towards these Jewish-Arabic studies, which we all have reason

² Cf. Goldziher in *Jewish Encyclopedia* VI 656, article "Islam".

to hope will receive from the new JEWISH QUARTERLY the same generous hospitality which was accorded to them by its predecessor.

I. SHIITIC ELEMENTS IN JEWISH SECTARIANISM

It has long since been recognized³ that the rise of Jewish sectarianism under the dominion of Islam was in a large measure the reflection of a corresponding phenomenon in the Muhammedan world. "In the second half of the seventh century and in the whole of the eighth," says the veteran investigator of Jewish sectarianism⁴, "as a result of the tremendous intellectual commotion produced throughout the Orient by the swift conquests of the Arabs and the collision of victorious Islam with the older religions and cultures of the world, there arose a large number of religious sects, especially in Persia, Babylonia ('Irāk), and Syria. Judaism did not escape the general fermentation; the weak remnants of early schism—the Sadducees and Essenes—picked up new life and flickered once more before their final extinction. But new sects also arose in Judaism, the most important of which were the 'Īsawites (called after their founder Abū 'Īsa), the Yūdḡānites and the Shādḡānites (followers of Yūdḡān and Shādḡān)." This correspondence between Jewish and Muhammedan heterodoxy is, indeed, not to be wondered at. Considering the close contact between Judaism and Islam from the very birth of the latter, it is but natural that their reciprocal influence should not be confined to their main currents, but extend as well to their tributaries and branches. The recognition of this in-

³ Already by Pinsker לקושי קדמוניות pp. 11, 13, and even earlier by Rappoport in *Kerem Hemed* V (1841) p. 204.

⁴ Harkavy in *Jew. Enc.* I 553^b, article "Anan."

ter-relation, however, has remained an abstract generality and has not been pursued in detail. In view of the great strides which our knowledge of the inner development of Islam has made in recent years, this task becomes more pressing and at the same time more promising in results. A careful study of the points of contact between the Jewish heterodoxy of that period and the corresponding process in Islam will enable us to grasp in its full significance the make-up of these Jewish sects which is otherwise incomprehensible. It will illustrate the saying: "*wie es sich christelt, so jüdet es sich*", which so inimitably characterizes the submissiveness of "emancipated" Jewry to the fads and fancies of its Christian environment, from the Muhammedan point of view. Of course, in confronting Jewish sectarianism with its Islamic predecessor one must guard against exaggerations and not drive analogies to the extreme. The influence of Islam over Judaism has never been of so disintegrating a nature as to suppress all genuine elements of Judaism even in its farthest ramifications. Karaism proper, except for the general condition of religious unrest characteristic of that age, scarcely shows any effect of heterodox Islam. And even the more radical sects, as the 'Īsawites, Yūdḡānites and the like, are largely swayed by halakic interests which are purely Jewish. Yet, with all these restrictions, the influence of Muhammedan heterodoxy on Jewish sectarianism cannot be doubted and presents a phenomenon which is of interest not only for the Jewish scholar but also for the student of comparative religion.

In speaking of Jewish sectarianism, a word must be said about our sources of information. The latter are, indeed, scanty and often fragmentary. Our main source is Kırķisānī (wrote in 937), who in the introductory chapters

of his *Kitāb al-anwār*⁵ gives a description of Jewish sects. Kırķisānī's material is mainly drawn from Dāwud b. Merwān al-Muḳammiṣ (IX. century)⁶, as is also the almost identical account of Hadassi (XII. century)⁷. Valuable material bearing on these early and on some later Jewish movements is contained in the Arabic original of Maimonides' *Iggeret Teman* in the paragraphs dealing with the Pseudo-Messiahs which in the Hebrew translations have been reduced to a few meager sentences^{7a}. To these Jewish sources must be added the detailed account of Shahrastānī (died 1153)⁸ who undoubtedly followed old sources, in this case perhaps Abū 'Īsa al-Warrāḳ, who is also quoted by Bīrūnī as his authority in Jewish

⁵ Published by Harkavy with a Russian introduction Petersburg 1894 (reprinted from the Memoirs of the Oriental Department of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society volume VIII). See also Bacher in *JQR.*, VII, 687 ff.

⁶ I may incidentally remark that the famous Spanish-Arabic theologian Ibn Ḥazm (died 1064) makes mention of al-Muḳammiṣ. In his *Milal wa'n-Niḥal* III 171, he protests against the view that God only kills those children of whom he knows that they would become sinners, a view held by men

كالفيمى سعيد بن يوسف والمعمس (read والمقمس) داود بن قزوان
(read الروان) وابراهيم البغدادي وابي كثير الطبراني منكمحي

اليهود. If the reading *المقمس* with *s* be correct, then the conjecture of Harkavy (l. l. introduction p. 260 and in the notes to Grätz-Rabinowitz III 498 note 1) who explains the name as "jumper" (from *ḵmṣ*) and applies it to his repeated conversions, could not be accepted.

⁷ *Eshkol ha-kofer* Goslov 1836 fol. 41^c.

^{7a} I refer to a manuscript, apparently a *unicum*, recently purchased from Mr. Ephraim Deinard and presented to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary by Judge Mayer Sulzberger. I hope to publish this important MS. in the near future.

⁸ Ed. Cureton I 168 f. I collated Cureton's text with four MSS. of the British Museum (Add. 7205; 7251; 23349; 23350). They differ only in details.

matters⁹. Scattered references by Bīrūnī (about 1000)¹⁰, Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1064), Maḳrīzī (d. 1442), and other Muhammedan writers¹¹ occasionally contain valuable data. The information derived from these sources, however, is not always reliable and is sometimes even contradictory¹²,—an observation by no means surprising to the student of Muhammedan heterodoxy and no doubt applicable to every religious sect which is only known from the description of its opponents. It will therefore be necessary to proceed with caution and discretion and to keep a steady eye on the general conditions and influences which dominate these sects.

Among later sectarian and, what is often identical, Messianic movements in Judaism the heresies of Sabbathai Zebi and Jacob Frank have been found to yield a number of striking illustrations. Occasionally similar movements of minor importance have been referred to. The sources from which our material has been derived will be named in due course.

As far as Muhammedan heterodoxy is concerned, I propose to deal on this occasion with the sects of Shiism, because out of the numerous factions of Islam it is the Shiitic heresy, with its peculiar mixture of doctrinal and political elements, which has more than any other profoundly affected the destinies of Islam and has succeeded in getting

⁹ Shahrastānī quotes al-Warrāk I 141, 143 on Shiitic doctrines, and p. 189, 192 on Manichæan and Mazdakæan heresies. According to p. 189, he was originally a Magian.

¹⁰ Cf. Bīrūnī's *Chronology of Ancient Nations* translated by Sachau pp. 270, 33; 278, 22 and 279, 13, where al-Warrāk's *Kitāb al-Maḳālāt* "Book of Heresies" is quoted. See also p. 431. I have not been able to ascertain the date of al-Warrāk.

¹¹ Cf. Poznański in JQR XVI 770.

¹² See later. Already Pinsker *l. c.* p. 5 *top* refers to this circumstance.

a strong and permanent hold over large sections of the Muhammedan community.

Before entering into the discussion of the relations between the sects of Judaism and those of Shiism, it will be advisable to recapitulate briefly the character and development of Shiism itself. This is the more necessary, as the latter, though figuring among the largest sects in the world, the number of its followers being estimated at 10,000,000, and counting, as it does, among its believers the Persians, "one of the most ancient, gifted, and original peoples in the world",¹³ is yet known but by name to the educated layman and not always grasped in its true character even by the student of the Orient.

Like every other doctrine which extends over various periods and countries, Shiism is a complicated historical phenomenon which cannot be squeezed into a single formula. We shall limit ourselves in the following to the essential features of Shiism, as far as they are apt to illustrate the rise and many of the characteristics of Jewish sectarianism.¹⁴

¹³ Edward G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* I p. IX.

¹⁴ A list of the most important works on Shiism will be found in my treatise "*The Heterodoxies of the Shiites according to Ibn Hazm*," New Haven 1909 (reprinted from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* vols. xxviii and xxix) II 2-5. I have endeavored to compile in this book, in connection with Ibn Hazm's account of Shiism, the available data from the various sources or, at least, to refer to such. On account of this bibliographical character of the book I have thought it convenient to refer to it in the following to substantiate the expositions in the text. It will be quoted briefly as *Shiites*. To the list given there must be added Browne's *Literary History of Persia* (New York 1902) which in the first volume gives a most graphic and instructive account of the inner life and particularly the religious movements in Persia up to the year 1000. A succinct and masterly presentation of Shiism will be found in Goldziher's *Resumé* on "the Religion of Islam" in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Teil I Abtheilung III, 1. Die orientalischen Religionen* Berlin and Leipzig 1906 p. 119 ff.

Shiism, in Arabic *Shī'a*¹⁵, signifying "party, followers, adherents", is an abbreviation for "*Shī'at 'Alī*," "the party of 'Alī", and originally designates those who believed that 'Alī, the cousin, later the fosterling and son-in-law of the Prophet and one of his earliest and sincerest converts, was the worthiest successor of Muhammed as the Commander of the Faithful and had stronger claims to the leadership of Islam than the first caliphs Abū Bekr, 'Omar, 'Othmān and Mu'āwiya who were elected or accepted in his stead. By extending their sympathies for 'Alī to his descendants, the *ahl al-bait*, "the people (or members) of the (Prophetic) Family," this party confines the rights to the Caliphate within the 'Alidic family, the latter being, in their opinion, worthier of this supreme post than any other, and consequently denies the claims of the Omayyad and 'Abbaside dynasties. This view which bases the claims of 'Alī and the 'Alides to the Caliphate on their worth or merit is the mildest form of Shiism. It is the cardinal doctrine of the *Zaidiyya*—a Shiitic sect which still prevails in Southern Arabia—but is also, slightly modified, accepted by the orthodox community at large, in which the "Members of the Family" have always been the object of reverence and affection.

In sharp contrast to the *Zaidiyya*, the *Imāmiyya*, constituting the bulk of the Shiites of to-day, hold the belief that the Caliphate or, as they prefer to call it, the *Imāmate*¹⁶, is not a matter of personal merit and therefore dependent on election, but is in its very nature hereditary.

¹⁵ Etymologically the same word as post-Biblical *סיעה*.

¹⁶ The title *Imām* originally applies to the man who stands in the front of the praying congregation and is used by the Shiites as signifying the head of the Muhammedan community.

They maintain that the Prophet left a written will in which he appointed 'Alī his successor and that the Companions¹⁷ of the Prophet who had the election of his successor in hand, out of jealousy and hostility to 'Alī, set aside this will and made it disappear. While the Zaidiyya, accordingly, look upon the elimination of 'Alī merely as an unfortunate mistake in judgment and therefore acquiesce in the election of the first so eminently successful caliphs as a *fait accompli*, the Imāmiyya repudiate¹⁸ the latter as wicked usurpers and place them as well as the other Companions, who, in their opinion, knowingly acted against the express will of the Prophet, on the level of *Kāfirs* or Infidels.

This attitude of the Imāmiyya towards the Companions also determines their relation to the oral tradition of Islam, the *Sunna* or the *Hadīth*. For the latter which was gradually considered as binding as the Koran and, with its elasticity and wider range of interests as well as in its immediate effect on practical life, was even superior to the Koran¹⁹, had assumed the shape of oral sayings, uttered by Muhammed or ascribed to him, and necessarily transmitted through one of the Companions. The Shiites, who repudiate the latter as infidels, were therefore in duty bound to reject the *Sunna* as conceived by the Orthodox or the Sunnites, to whom tradition was inseparable from the Companions, and were, in consequence, faced by the necessity of parting with the major and most vital portion of Muhammedan religion. From this disastrous consequence—for oral tra-

¹⁷ The *Aṣḥāb* or associates of Muhammed who are revered by the orthodox Muhammedans and regarded by them as the only competent transmitters of the oral utterances of the Prophet.

¹⁸ Hence the Imāmiyya and sometimes the Shiites in general are nicknamed *Rawāḥid* or *Rāḥidā*, "repudiators, deserters." Cf. *Shiites* II 137 ff.

¹⁹ Cf. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* II 20.

dition was as indispensable for the growth of Islam as it is for that of any other religious community—, the Shiites were saved by their reverence for the “Members of the Family”. Since their objection to the oral tradition of Islam was not an objection to tradition as such but solely to its bearers as represented by the Companions, they had but to substitute the names of the ‘Alides for those of the Companions in order to secure the blessings of the Prophetic word. It is flagrantly incorrect, therefore, when it is so often maintained that the Shiites are opposed to oral tradition. It is true, they reject the collections of traditions regarded as authoritative by the Sunnites. But they have evolved such collections of their own, which are similar in substance to the orthodox collections and differ from them mainly in the personnel of the bearers of tradition, ‘Alī and his descendants serving as the transmitting link instead of the Companions. “This difference in the authentication of the religious sources has scarcely produced any material changes in the evolution of religious usages. Only in a few insignificant details does the religious *practice* of the Shiites differ from that of the Sunnites.”²⁰

This, as it were, political and purely Islamic essence of Shiism was soon overgrown with two elements from the outside, which were in part also accepted by orthodox Islam but were over-emphasized and driven to their last consequences in Shiism. We refer to the conception of prophecy and the Messianic belief.

²⁰ Goldziher in *Orientalische Religionen* p. 122.—I have dwelt on this point at some length in order to show how superficial and erroneous it is to conceive of Karaism, as is so often done, as a parallel to or even a consequence of Shiism. If one should insist on analogies, then the similarity would rather consist in this that Karaism, like Shiism, has *not* been able to shake off oral tradition altogether.

The conception of prophecy in Islam is, as was recently shown by Goldziher²¹, the outgrowth of Neo-platonic and Gnostic speculations which in the centuries prior to Islam had so profoundly influenced the religious thought of the East.²² It pictures prophecy, as a result of the theory of Emanation, in the form of a "Luminous Substance", first implanted by God in Adam, the immediate product of His creative activity, and then passing among his worthiest descendants from one to the other²³, thus forming a chain of prophets who are the possessors of this Divine Substance²⁴. This conception had forced its way into orthodox Islam. But while according to the latter this "Luminous Substance" found its most perfect and ultimate embodiment in Muhammed whom both Koran and Tradition declare with equal emphasis to be the last of the prophets²⁵, according to the Shiites, this substance passed over from Muhammed to 'Alī and from 'Alī to his descendants, the Imams. The Imams, who were conceived as a dynasty in which son succeeds father, are accordingly vested in Shiism with Divine authority and, as the heirs of the Divine Substance, are raised above the level of human limitations. The outgrowth of this conception was, among other extravagant doctrines, the belief in the infallibility of the Imams and in their Mystic Knowledge, embracing the events of

²¹ *Neuplatonische und gnostische Elemente im Hadit in Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* XXII 328 ff.

²² See later.

²³ This conception which is the cardinal tenet of most Shiitic sects (see later), also forms the basis of Judah Halevi's theory of the סגולה (Book I §§ 47, 95.) See Goldziher, *Le Amr ilāhī (hā'in'yān hā-elōhī) chez Juda Halēvi in Revue des Études Juives* I, 32 ff. Cf. also *Shiites* II 104.

²⁴ More on this doctrine see later.

²⁵ See Goldziher in *Orientalische Religionen* p. 126, cf. also *Shiites* I 47; II 46 f.

all Past and all Future, little short of Omniscience²⁶. The Imams are consistently regarded as the only legitimate, because God-inspired, source of all truth, both religious and secular, before which the light of reason and research fades into insignificance.²⁷ This conception of the nature of the Imams is dangerously near the point where the Imams become gods, a step which was actually taken by the more radical sections of the Shī'a, the so-called *Ġulāt* or "Exaggerators", while the bulk of the Shiites carefully guard against this consequence which is subversive of all Islam and Monotheism.

Of still greater significance for the development and particularly for the external history of Shiism was the second element, the belief in the Messiah or, to use the Muhammedan term, the *Mahdī*.²⁸ This belief in a mysterious personage who is to appear in the fulness of time and, to use the Muhammedan phraseology²⁹, is "to fill the earth with justice as it is now filled with injustice", is not an integral part of orthodox Islam. The Koran makes no

²⁶ See Goldziher l. l. p. 121. On the omniscience of the Imams see *Shiites* II 15 f., 54 f.

²⁷ Cf. the characteristic utterances of Shiitic authorities *Shiites* II 15 f., 54 f.

²⁸ Literally: *the one who is rightly guided*. The root **ه د ي** is used with great frequency in the Koran. But one would rather expect the *active* form *Hādī*, "the one who guides rightly", which is actually found as a title of Mānī, see Flügel, *Mani* p. 306. Ḥusein, the son of 'Alī, is designated as *Hādī Mahdī* in Tabarī, *Annales* II 350, 14. I am inclined to believe that the *passive* form was chosen as an analogy to *Masiḥ*, the title applied by Muhammed—under Syrian influence—to Christ who was originally identified with the Mahdī (see presently). This would also apply to *Manṣūr* "the one who is helped" (see *Shiites* II 109), a title by which also the Mahdī of the Samaritans is designated (Goldziher in *Zeitschrift der Deutsch-Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* LVI 411 f.).

²⁹ Cf. *Shiites* II 30 f.

mention of the Mahdī³⁰ and even the Hadith is not unequivocal on the subject.³¹ The modern adherents of the orthodox Ḥanafīyya school³² as well as prominent theologians of various schools and ages³³ reject this belief in the Mahdī. Originally the Messianic expectations of Islam were associated with, and limited to, Jesus, who was believed, in consonance with certain Christian teachings, to reappear or "return" at the end of time and fill the earth with justice. In other words, Jesus was to be the Messiah or, as a later utterance ascribed to Muhammed puts it, "there is no Mahdī except 'Īsa the son of Maryam.'"³⁴ This belief in the "return" of Christ, which is perhaps alluded to in the Koran itself³⁵, was early adopted by all Muhammedans. However, in the beginning of Islam with its glorious activities and triumphs there was little room for the expectation of a Messianic future. It was only after the outbreak of civil strife and the terrible struggle within the Muhammedan community, when the earth seemed to be filled with injustice, that the Messianic hopes turned from abstract speculations into living expectations.³⁶ But the Arabs, filled with national pride and looking down on all non-Arabs as their inferiors, preferred to associate the inauguration of the Messianic age with one of their own blood and faith and so the belief

³⁰ Cf. James Darmsteter, *Le Mahdi* Paris 1885 p. 15; Snouck-Hurgronje, *Der Mahdi* (reprinted from *Revue Coloniale Internationale* vol. I) p. 4.

³¹ Cf. Ibn Khaldūn *Prolegomena* ed. Quatremere II 163 ff., in his admirable presentation of the Mahdī doctrine.

³² Snouck-Hurgronje l. l. pp. 5 and 37.

³³ E. g., the great thinker Ibn Khaldūn (died 1406), cf. note 4. Ibn Ḥazm (died 1064) expresses the opinion that the Mahdī doctrine is an invention of the Persians, *Shiites* I 36.

³⁴ Snouck-Hurgronje l. l. p. 16.

³⁵ *Ibidem* p. 8.

³⁶ Cf. my essay *Die Messiasidee im Islam* in *Festschrift zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage A. Berliner's* p. 122.

in a national Arabic Mahdī displaced the earlier expectation of Jesus who was now reduced to a forerunner and lieutenant of the Mahdī.³⁷

As to the personality of the Mahdī, who was but the embodiment of the ideal qualities of a Caliph, orthodox Muhammedan tradition placed no limitations on his descent, merely insisting on those qualities. The Mahdī was to rise from the midst of the Arabs, later of the Muhammedans in general. The Shiites, however, who regarded the "Members of the Family" as the receptacles of Divine truth and grace, could not consistently accept a Mahdī who was not a descendant of the sacred dynasty.³⁸ Adopting the old Jewish-Christian idea of the "concealment"³⁹ of the Messiah, they identified the Mahdī with certain historical personages who had already appeared in life and who would, similarly to the "return" of Jesus, reappear or return to fill the earth with justice. This belief became the motive power in all Shiitic movements and revolutions. Every "Member of the Family" thus became a candidate for the post of the Mahdī and there was scarcely an 'Alide whose reappearance or "return" was not looked for by one sect or another. Out of the innumerable Shiitic sects and factions which owe

³⁷ Darmsteter l. l. p. 13, Snouck-Hurgronje l. l. p. 14. In early Islam even separate tribes and families expected a Mahdī from their own midst. See on these national-Arabic Messiahs van Vloten, *Recherches sur la domination arabe, le Chiitisme et les croyances messianiques sous le Khalifat des Omayyades*, Amsterdam 1894, p. 60 ff. and Snouck-Hurgronje l. l. p. 11 note 1.

³⁸ There is a tradition, forged of course, to the effect that "there will be no Mahdī except from the members of my Family." Among the numerous parallels between Judaism and Shiism quoted in the anthology of Ibn 'Abd-Rabbihi (died 940) from older sources (*al-'iḡd al-farīd* Cairo 1293H I 269) the following similarity is pointed out: "The Jews say, the king can only be from the family of David. The Rāfida (=Shiites) say, the king can only be from the family of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib."

³⁹ *Shiites* II 28. More about it later.

their origin to this expectation, I will single out two which are the most important and at the same time the most characteristic, being based on arithmetic speculations. Sacred numbers, especially 7 and 12, play an important part in Shiitic heterodoxy,⁴⁰ and they constantly recur under various forms. Hence we find on the one hand the *Sab'iyya*, the "Seveners,"⁴¹ who accept as the Mahdī Ismā'il b. Ja'far, the *seventh* Imam after 'Alī, a sect which under the name of Ismailites and Karmatians was of such tremendous consequences in the history of Islam and eventually led to the establishment of the Fatimide caliphate⁴². On the other hand we meet the *Ithnā'ashariyya*, the "Twelvers,"⁴³ believing in the *twelfth* Imam, a certain Muhammed b. al-Hasan (born about 872) who disappeared as a child and who is expected to return as the Mahdī in the fulness of time⁴⁴. This expectation forms the cardinal doctrine of the Imāmiyya who practically represent the whole of Shiism of the present day⁴⁵.

The further spread and development of Shiism is determined by the early conquests of Islam and the gradual shifting of the Islamic center into the domain of Persian civilization. It is generally believed and was up till recently

⁴⁰ See *Shiites Index* s. v. *Seven* and *Ithnā'ashariyya*. Cf. Browne, *Literary History of Persia* I 310. On these numbers as well as on the number 19 see later.

⁴¹ Browne l. l. p. 391 ff.

⁴² A very elaborate account of this movement will be found in de Goeje's *Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahrain et les Fatimides*. Second edition. Leyden 1886, p. 23.

⁴³ Cf. *Shiites Index* s. h. v.

⁴⁴ Ibn Hāzīm (*Shiites* I 48, 76, cf. II 53) maintains that this Mahdī was never born. Houtsma (in a private communication) is inclined to agree with Ibn Hāzīm.

⁴⁵ In orthodox Islam, however, the Mahdī gradually assumed the function of destroying the infidels, Snouck-Hurgronje l. l. p. 25.

asserted by scholars that Shiism is Persian in origin. This view can no more be upheld. The doctrines discussed above come from different sources, and recent investigation⁴⁶ has shown that the founders and earliest exponents of Shiism were not Persians. But there can be no doubt that the Persians were exceptionally ripe for the teachings of Shiism. The hereditary nature of the Imamate appeared to the Persians as a matter of course. The election of a king seemed to them impossible and utterly preposterous⁴⁷. The conception of the Imams as the heirs and possessors of the Divine "Luminous Substance" found its counterpart in the Persian conception of royalty as the possessors of the "*far-rukhi-Kayānī*", "the Royal Splendor"⁴⁸, or the "*farrī yas-dān*", "the Divine Glory" conceived in the form of a subtle flame⁴⁹. The belief in a Mahdī who is to inaugurate the Golden Age found its parallel in similar Persian conceptions of a *Saoshyant*, a Savior,⁵⁰ and in the more definite expectation of the "return" of the mythical *Bahrām Hamāvand*⁵¹.

⁴⁶ Especially Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, Berlin 1901 p. 90 ff., whose main thesis is accepted by Goldziher in *Orientalische Religionen* p. 119. I may also refer to my article '*Abdallah b. Sabā, der Begründer der Schi'a, und sein jüdischer Ursprung*' in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* voll. xxiii and xxiv.

⁴⁷ Cf. Browne l. l. 130.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem* p. 128.

⁴⁹ Darmsteter, *Le Mahdi* p. 22.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem* p. 26.

⁵¹ Blochet, *Le Messianisme dans l'hétérodoxie Musulmane*, Paris 1903 p. 126 ff. In support of Blochet's thesis I may mention that Ibn Ḥazm, *Mīlāl wa'n-Nihāl* I 139 refers briefly to "the expectation on the part of the Persian Magians of Bahrām Hamāvand, the rider of the cow;" similarly I 116 l. 6: "when B. H. will have appeared on the cow to bring back their kingdom". The Southern Arabian writer Nashwān (quoted by D. H. Müller, *Die Burgen und Schlösser Südarabiens. Sitzungsberichte der philos.-hist. Classe der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* 1879, p. 407 note 6) speaks instead of Bahrām Gūr, the Sasanian King.

This dogmatic affinity between Persian and Shiitic ideas was powerfully assisted by political circumstances. The Persians, who with the rapidity of lightning had been turned from lords into slaves, eagerly embraced Islam, largely because the new religion promised its converts equality of treatment and opportunity. In this, however, they were bitterly disappointed. Instead of equality and remuneration, they met from the Arabs and the Omayyads, who represented them, with contempt and oppression⁵². They were thus driven into the arms of the opposition and, since the opposition to the Omayyad dynasty centered around the 'Alides who were regarded as the rightful claimants to the Caliphate, the Persians joined the *Shī'at 'Alī*, the "party of 'Alī", i. e. became Shiites⁵³. This political character of the opposition could not but have, in turn, an immediate effect on the religious development of the Persians. Islam was meant to be a universal religion. But having arisen in the seclusion of the Arabic peninsula, it could not disguise, and in the early period of the Arabic conquests it wilfully emphasized, its Arabic character. The hatred which the Persians bore towards the Arabs as their conquerors and oppressors could not but affect their sentiments towards Islam as represented by the Arabs⁵⁴. Bound up, as they were, with Islam which they could no more abandon⁵⁵, they began to refashion it and to foist upon it all the doctrines and traditions they had cherished heretofore. Thus Shiism, being a protest against orthodox Islam as represented by the Arabs, became the receptacle of all the re-

⁵² See especially Browne l. l. p. 232 ff. who largely follows van Vloten.

⁵³ Although official Shiism was introduced into Persia much later.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Shiites*, Introduction I 2. Ibn Ḥazm clearly saw and expressed this relationship, *ibidem* I 35 ff., cf. II 16 f.

⁵⁵ Apostasy in Islam is punishable by death.

ligious influences that had been dominant in the former Persian Empire.

These influences were as varied in character as they were different in origin. For the old Persian Empire⁵⁶ had for centuries been the battle-ground of numerous conflicting cultures. The ancient religion of Babylon still exerted its influence, surviving in various sects, such as the Mandæans⁵⁷, and transmitted through other channels. The religion of Zoroaster had reigned supreme for centuries. Persia was the home of Manichæism which, despite all persecutions, still had numerous adherents and spread its powerful influence far beyond the boundaries of Persia⁵⁸. The tenets of Mazdak outlived the destruction of its believers and continued as an important spiritual factor⁵⁹. The neo-Platonic and Gnostic doctrines, which very early asserted their influence through the medium of the above sects, had been, as it were, personally introduced in the middle of the sixth century through the exiled philosophers of Byzantium.⁶⁰ Among these agencies must also be counted the ancient paganism or the so-called Sabæism of Harrân, whose adherents were also largely represented in 'Irāk⁶¹, not to speak of the great Jewish and Christian centers and perhaps Hindoo influences⁶². All these variegated elements, often in

⁵⁶ Including of course, Irāk (Babylonia). We know that this province had many Persian inhabitants, and was entirely under the influence of Persian culture. In Arabic times Persian was still spoken in the markets of Kufa (*Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenländischen Gesellschaft* xxxviii, 392) and a Shiitic impostor of the same city had the audacity to maintain that, when he ascended to heaven, he was addressed by God in *Persian* (*Shiites* II 90 l. 22).

⁵⁷ On Mandæan influences in Shiism cf. *Shiites* II 82 ff., 84, 87.

⁵⁸ See especially Browne l. l. p. 154 ff.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem* p. 166 ff.

⁶⁰ Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte* p. 114.

⁶¹ Chwolson, *Sabier* I 482 ff.

⁶² On the assumption of Hindoo influence on Islam see Browne l. l. p.

a modified or mutilated shape, found expression in a motley multitude of Shiitic sects with a weird mixture of all possible doctrines and practices which were artificially harmonized with the official religion by means of allegorical interpretation.

These sects are a characteristic feature of the history of Islam in Persia from the Arabic conquest down to modern times. We have seen that the motive power in all these sectarian movements was the Persian resentment against Arabic rule and oppression. Hence these movements were never purely doctrinal but were at the same time political and, in accordance with the spirit of the age, Messianic or Mahdistic. They were revolutionary in character and were directed against the government. The proper beginning of these movements may be said to coincide with the beginning of the second Muhammedan century, when the end of the first century of the dominion of the new religion had reawakened eschatological expectations in all sections of Islam, when the fruits of the Omayyad oppression had begun to ripen and when, above all, the subterranean propaganda of the 'Alides, shortly before organized, had grown to be a powerful factor in political life⁶³. Most of these early sects make their appearance in Kufa⁶⁴ which had once been the capital under 'Ali⁶⁵ and was now the center of the Shiitic propaganda. With the shifting of this propaganda into the eastern provinces of Persia, the Shiitic sects move also eastward. These sectarian movements become more and more numerous with the growing weakness of the Omayyad government. The end of

⁶³ Cf. van Vloten l. l. p. 44 ff.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Shiites* Index s. v. *Kufa*.

⁶⁵ Cf. Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien* p. 56.

the Omayyad period presents an uninterrupted chain of such uprisings and revolutions. The scattered attempts are now organized by Abū Muslim, "the Master of the Propaganda", into one great movement which is centered in Khorāsān and finally leads to the overthrow of the Omayyads. The revolutionary movement had been started and conducted in the name of the 'Alides. But by a dexterous move the 'Abbasides displaced the "Members of the Family". New uprisings follow, led by the Persians Sinbād (757 C. E.),⁶⁶ Ustadsīs (766-768)⁶⁷, Muḡanna' (777-780)⁶⁸, Bābak (816-838)⁶⁹, and others, and combining heterodox teachings with revolutionary, and what is identical, Messianic tendencies. Gradually, however, these movements lose their political revolutionary character. With the 'Abbasides, who were themselves half Persians⁷⁰, the Persian element gradually gets the upper hand. The resentment against the Arabs dies away and the sects henceforward, as far as Persia is concerned, assume a purely doctrinal aspect.

These tremendous upheavals in the eastern dominions of Islam form the background on which stands out the corresponding movement in Judaism. In the light of the historical conditions, as briefly sketched above, the rise of Jewish sectarianism under Islamic dominion assumes a larger aspect and a deeper significance. Time, place, and character of this movement receive their proper historical setting.

⁶⁶ See Blochet, *Le Messianisme dans l'hétérodoxie Musulmane* p. 44 f. Browne l. l. p. 313 f.

⁶⁷ Browne, l. l. p. 317.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem* p. 318 ff.; *Shiites* II 120 ff.

⁶⁹ Browne l. l. p. 323 ff.

⁷⁰ Their mothers were mostly of Persian blood.

It is certainly not accidental that the rise of Jewish sectarianism under Islam belongs to the same period which forms a turning point in the history of Islam and Shiism, marked by the struggle between the Omayyad government and the forces opposed to it. The earliest⁷¹ representatives of Jewish sectarianism were Abū 'Īsa of Ispahan—his first name is not certain⁷²—and his followers the 'Īsawiyya, or Iṣfahāniyya⁷³. The date of Abū 'Īsa's appearance is differently transmitted by Kīrkisānī and Shahrastānī. According to the former, "his appearance took place in the days of 'Abdalmelik, the son of Merwān,"⁷⁴ who reigned 685-705. Shahrastānī, however, circumstantially relates that "he lived in the time of Manṣūr (754-775), but his propaganda began in the time of the last king of the Omayyads, Merwān b. Muhammed al-Ḥimār (744-750)"⁷⁵ and

⁷¹ The movement of Serene in Syria stands entirely apart. See later p. 211.

⁷² According to Kīrkisānī (in several places) and Hadassi his Jewish name was Obadiah. Ibn Ḥazm, *Mīlāl wa'n-Niḥāl* I 99 l. 11 says: "it has reached me that his name was Muhammad b. 'Īsa." This combination of the names of Jesus and Muhammed is most probably an afterthought, cf. Poznański in JQR. xvi 770. Shahrastānī calls him Iṣḥāk b. Ya'qūb and adds: "but it is said that his name was 'Ufīd Alūhīm." The latter is undoubtedly עובר אלהים and identical with Obadiah. The form of the name is very strange. I am inclined to think that the Jews of Ispahan or those who are responsible for Shahrastānī's data refrained from pronouncing יהוה and used instead אלהים.

⁷³ The first form is the most frequent and is used by all Arabic writers. Kīrkisānī prefers the second form, cf. p. 284, 11 (where a variant reads 'Īsawiyya) and in the Manuscript of the British Museum Or. 2524 fol. 33^b. Similarly Hadassi העיסוניים. Iṣfahāniyya or, more correctly, Iṣbaāniyya is found in Makrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ* (ed. Cairo) IV 372 l. 18 and in Su'udī (wrote 1535), *Disputatio pro religione Mohammedanorum contra Christianos* Leiden 1890 p. 189.

⁷⁴ Kīrkisānī 284, 6. This statement is left out by Hadassi. Did David al-Muḥammiṣ have it?

⁷⁵ Shahrastānī I 168.

then narrates,⁷⁶ how he and his army were killed by Maṣṣūr at Rai (near Teheran). Grätz⁷⁷, who did not know Kīrkīsānī, follows Shahrastānī. Harkavy⁷⁸ unhesitatingly accepts Kīrkīsānī's statement and bases on the earlier appearance of Abū 'Īsa the conjecture that he influenced the rise of Karaism. It is, however, impossible to follow Kīrkīsānī. The historical conditions decidedly speak against it. The systematic outbreaks of Shiitic sectarianism in 'Irāk and the other Persian provinces did not, owing to the causes indicated above, take place before the reign of Hishām (724-743=105-125 Hijra), the son of 'Abdalmelik⁷⁹. And even then the uprisings were of small dimensions⁸⁰; they were quickly put down by the Omayyad governors and they scarcely affected the Caliphate to such a degree as to make it possible for a Jew to gather an army and resist the government. Particularly the reign of 'Abdalmelik, despite frequent skirmishes with the Khārijites in the East, which, however, were local,⁸¹ was characterized by strength and discipline. On the other hand, the date given by Shahrastānī agrees most perfectly with the historical circumstances. Under the last Omay-

⁷⁶ Prefacing it by *wa-ḳīla* "and it is said".

⁷⁷ *Geschichte* V³ 404.

⁷⁸ In his introduction to Kīrkīsānī p. 277, also in his notes to Grätz-Rabinowitz III 502.

⁷⁹ Cf. the movements of Khidāsh (on him and similar rebels see Wellhausen, *Des arabisches Reich* p. 315 ff.), Muḡīra, Bayān, Abū Maṣṣūr, Abū 'l-Khaṭṭāb, and the numerous factions of the Khattābiyya (see on all these *Shiites* Index), nearly all contemporaneous, in the first half of the second Muḥammedan century. The rebellion of Mukhtār (died 67 = 687) nearly half a century earlier (Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien* p. 74 ff.) was of a different character. Moreover, it did not affect Persia proper.

⁸⁰ See, e. g., *Shiites* II 79 l. 36. This is the impression one gets throughout from the accounts on the sects of this period.

⁸¹ Cf. August Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland* I 389.

yad Muhammed b. Merwān the 'Alidic propaganda which had till then been undermining the Empire, especially in the East, broke out openly. With the moment when Abū Muslim, the chief of the propagandist forces, unfurled the black standard of the 'Abbasides in a village near Merv (June 9, 747), Persia became a seething caldron of anarchy and revolution. It was, as Wellhausen⁸² puts it, "a time of adventurers and men of pluck," and Abū Muslim was often compelled to fight the latter, as he did the forces of the Omayyad government. One of these adventurers was Bihāfarīd,⁸³ who rose in Nīsābūr preaching ancient Persian doctrines and was put to death by Abū Muslim. Another sectarian, who is of immediate interest to us, was 'Abdallah b. Mu'āwiya⁸⁴ who rebelled in Kufa *against the last Omayyad*, combining political claims with extravagant doctrines. He was forced to retreat into the East, where he formed an independent empire and even struck his own coins, and settled temporarily in Ispahan. He was put to death by Abū Muslim in 129 H (=747 C. E). But centuries later there were still people who believed that 'Abdallah was concealed in the mountains of Ispahan and would return thence to fill the earth with justice. Abū Muslim himself was not merely a political agitator but also the representative, at least the object, of certain extravagant doctrines. There was a sect named after him the Muslimiyya⁸⁵ which believed in his Divine nature and expected his "return" as the Messiah. When Abū Muslim had been treacherously murdered by Manṣūr (February 12, 755), fresh revolts, headed

⁸² *Das arabische Reich* p. 231.

⁸³ Browne l. l. p. 308 ff.

⁸⁴ *Shiites* II 44 ff. Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich* p. 239 f.; 311.

⁸⁵ See *Shiites* Index s. v. *Abū Muslim*.

The sects of Shiism first rise in 'Irāk, especially in Kufa, and gradually move to the eastern Persian provinces. When we examine the long list of Jewish sectarians contained in Kīrkisānī's account,⁹⁰ we find, as was long ago observed by Harkavy,⁹¹ that their *gentilicia*, with very few exceptions, point to inner Persia. We encounter such designations as Iṣfahānī, 'Okbarī (twice), Nahāwendī, Za'farānī, Tiflīsī, Damagānī, or Kūmisī, to which may also be added names like Yūdḡān, Shāḡakān or Shārakān,⁹² and Mūshkān,⁹³ of

to detach Maimonides' words from Abū 'Isa's appearance, there are difficulties in the way of this identification. **נַעֲבֵר הַנָּהָר** (the Hebrew expression is also used in the Arabic original) can in my opinion be nothing else but *Mā warā an-nahr*, the Arabic name for Transoxania. The biblical meaning of **הַנָּהָר** as Euphrates is scarcely in accordance with the style of the translator of this letter. Besides, the designation of Ispahan, whose position must have been known to Maimonides, as "beyond the Euphrates", is a rather curious geographical definition. Maimonides' further statement **וְהִיטָה הָאוֹת שְׁלוֹ שֶׁל מְצוּרַת הַשְּׁכִימִים בְּרִיא** contradicts Kīrkisānī (284, 10; 311, 20) who narrates that his "miracle of legitimation" consisted in his producing books, despite his being illiterate, a fact to which Kīrkisānī often refers in his (unpublished) polemics against the 'Isawiyya. Grätz V³ 156 has misunderstood the latter statement, which he knew from Hadassi, and refers the former miracle to Abū 'Isa, without even mentioning the difficulty. It is not impossible that that stirring period,—“the East was then without a master and he who laid hands on, had the power” (Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien* p. 98)—saw many more Jewish Messianic movements of which we know nothing. I shall revert to this point later in these STUDIES.

⁹⁰ p. 284-285.

⁹¹ *Revue des Études Juives* V 208.

⁹² The Muhammedan theologian Bāḡdādī (died 1038) in his *Kitāb al-farq* (MS. Berlin No. 2800, cf. *Shīites* I 26 f.) mentions, alongside of the 'Isawiyya, the Shārakāniyya (sic), supposedly (cf. note 3) named after their founder Shārakān (fol. 4^a; this passage was discussed and published by Schreiner in *Revue des Études Juives* XXIX 206 ff.). In another passage (fol. 92^b), however, not mentioned by Schreiner, the same sect is

spelt **شاذكانية** Shāḡakāniyya. Schreiner (*ibidem* p. 207) rightly supposes that this sect is identical with the **שִׁאֲרָאֲנִיָּה** mentioned by Yefet b. 'Alī (in Pinsker's *Likḡute* p. 26. The Arabic *kāf* in these names is the Persian *gāf*.

⁹³ Shahrastānī I 169. The name of the sect and its supposed (see follow

Persian Jews a ready victim to all possible heresies which were set afloat by ambitious sectarians and, because rooted in ancient Persian tradition, were eagerly grasped by the Persian population⁹⁸.

The character of Jewish sectarianism is sufficiently determined by the above expositions: it is exotic and in the main the reflection of Muhammedan, more correctly Shiitic, heterodoxy, as manifested in Persia, and presenting a combination of doctrinal and political, or Messianic, tendencies. In defending this proposition which apparently is also implied in the remarks of Harkavy quoted in the beginning of our expositions,⁹⁹ we cannot ignore an essentially different theory, set forth by Grätz with his usual force and fascination. According to Grätz, Jewish sectarianism owes its origin rather to the Jews of Arabia, who had been exiled by Muhammed. "The origin of this [sectarian] movement," says Grätz,¹⁰⁰ "which divided the Jewish commonwealth of the East and West into two camps, dates from the first Gaonic century¹⁰¹. The Babylonian Talmud held sway over the Jewish community in Babylonia. . . . By the expansion of the Islamic dominion...the authority of the Talmud was extended far beyond its original bounds... The Babylonian-Persian¹⁰² communities felt in no wise hampered by the Talmudical ordinances which were of their own creation and had sprung up in their midst... Not so,

⁹⁸ Kīrkisānī (316, 2) expressly states that "the heresies were numerous among the (Jewish) inhabitants of Jibāl, i. e. Media." Interesting in this connection is the list of heresies enumerated by Yefet b. 'Alī in Pinsker's *Liḳḳute* p. 26. More about it later.

⁹⁹ p. 185.

¹⁰⁰ *Geschichte* V³ 151; English translation III 118 f.

¹⁰¹ Here the German edition offers a somewhat guarded sentence which is left out in the English translation.

¹⁰² The German edition merely has: the Babylonian.

however, with the Arabian Jews who had emigrated from Arabia to Palestine, Syria, and Irak, the Benu Kainukaa, the Benu Nadhir and the Chaibarites. They were sons of the desert, men of the sword, soldiers, and warriors, accustomed from their childhood to a free life and to the development of their strength; men who cultivated social intercourse with their former Arabic allies and fellow-soldiers in whose midst they again settled after the conquest of Persia and Syria. Judaism was indeed dear to them... But between the Judaism which they practised in Arabia and the Judaism taught by the Talmud and set up as a standard by the Babylonian colleges, there lay a deep gulf. To conform to Talmudical precepts, it would have been necessary for them to renounce their genial familiarity with their former comrades and to give up their drinking-bouts with the Arabs which, despite their interdiction by the Koran, the latter greatly loved. In a word, they felt themselves hampered by the Talmud... But from whatever cause this aversion to Talmudical precepts may have arisen, it is certain that it first had its origin in the Arabian-Jewish colony in Syria or Irak."

This construction of Grätz with all its numerous implications is wholly unacceptable. To begin with, the home and the center of Jewish sectarianism is, as we have just seen, not 'Irāk or Syria, but Persia. The movement of Serene which, according to our data, took place in Syria,¹⁰³ more correctly in Northern Syria,¹⁰⁴ stands entirely isolated¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Grätz V³ 401 f.

¹⁰⁴ I infer this from the name of the founder. Serene שריני (the reading שריני is not a variant but a misprint) is neither Hebrew nor Arabic nor Persian. Brüll in *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Litteratur* 1889 p. 119 rightly suggests that שריני was but a by-name, his first name being סעורא or זעורא. In analogy to the name of other sectarians we expect a

and the data about it are very scanty¹⁰⁶ and contain much that appears very strange¹⁰⁷. The few hundred Arabian Jews

gentilicium with the ending *ī*. Fürst (quoted by Brüll *ibidem*) suggests the derivation from Sirin in Galilee. Since, however, all the sources agree that he rose in Syria (Grätz *ibidem*) and the Byzantine writers call him simply τῷ Σύρῳ I would rather propose to pronounce his name *Suryānī* "the

Syrian" (سُرْيَانِي, سُورْيَانِي = שְׂרִינִי). On the transcription of *sīn* through cf. *Revue des Études Juives* XXXII 144.) The original Arabic name for Syria was *Sha'm*. But this designation was gradually limited to Southern Syria. Evidence of the above use of the Arabic word in the period under consideration is found in a Gaonic responsum (Harkavy's *Responsen* p. 230):

סוריא כמה מדינות היא כגון דמשק וחלב ומבוק ועד חרן אותן מקומות שעל עליוני פרת קרוין סוריא ושמה בלשון ישמעאלי סוריאיה ולשון סורסי וכתב סורסי שהוא עכשו ביד נצרים בבבל וקוראין אותו סוריאני על שם אותו מקום הוא נקרא (cf. Ginzberg, *Geonica* II 174). The same differentiation between *Sha'm* and *Sha'mī*, South Syria and Southern Syrian, and *Sūriyye* and *Suryānī* (or *Sūrī*), North Syria and Northern Syrian, is, as a competent Palestinian friend informs me, still ordinarily used in the East at the present day.—Poznański, JQR. VIII 699 note 1 derives the name from Shirin (שִׁרִינִי = שְׂרִינִי near Karmesin in Persia). If this be correct—which, on the strength of the available material, I am inclined to doubt—this would only strengthen the thesis defended in the text.

¹⁰⁵ It is difficult to say whether the remnants of the 'Isāwīyya which, as Kīrkisānī (284, 11, 317, 6; also MS. British Museum Or. 2524 fol. 34^a) narrates, were still to be found in Damascus in the time of this writer had any connection with Serene and his movement. Kīrkisānī also mentions a sectarian from Ramla (285, 13). See Schreiner in REJ. XXIX 207. On the sect of Meswi of Baalbek see Grätz V³ 450.

¹⁰⁶ The only information about his tenets is contained in a few words in a responsum of the Gaon Natronai in the collection שְׁעָרֵי צֶדֶק p. 24^a. See Grätz V³ 401 f. This Natronai is not, as Grätz thinks, Natronai I (about 719), but, as was pointed out by Brüll, *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Litteratur* 1889 p. 119 and Ginzberg *Geonica* I 50 note 1, Natronai II (859-869). The Gaon plainly refers to the *Karaites* and characterizes them as opponents of the Talmud. Since he distinguishes them from the followers of Serene, it is not permissible to emphasize so strongly the anti-Talmudic character of the latter and to use it as a basis for further deductions, as is done by Grätz.

¹⁰⁷ It is scarcely credible that the Jews of Spain should have been affected by an obscure sectarian in Syria to such an extent as to leave all

of the Banū Ẕeinuḡaa and Banū Nādīr, who, when expelled by Muhammed, settled in Southern Syria,¹⁰⁸ could scarcely, ignorant nomads that they were,¹⁰⁹ have prompted a new religious movement. The bulk of the Arabian Jews, consisting of the Khaibarites, were settled in Kufa.¹¹⁰ But their presence in 'Irāḡ, except for their influence on Muhammedan theologians,¹¹¹ left no trace whatever. Nor can the anti-Talmudic character of the Arabian Jews be conceded so easily. We know but very little about the inner condition of the Arabian Jews at the time of Muhammed. But to judge by what Islam borrowed from them, they must have been deeply influenced by Talmudic tradition.¹¹² Moreover, we have positive evidence that those Jews who remained in Arabia submitted to the authority of the Geonim.¹¹³ But it is above all a mistaken notion to seek the source of Jewish or Eastern sectarianism in considerations of ease and convenience. Antinomianism has never been a creative force in the religious development of the East. It is true, the

their property which was confiscated by the government, and that neither Ẕirkisānī nor any other Jewish writer should know anything about it.

¹⁰⁸ Grätz V³. p. 99-100, Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam* I p. 523.

¹⁰⁹ On the ignorance of the Arabian Jews cf. Geiger, *Was hat Muhammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen* p. 10. The fact of the nomadic and, in consequence, uncultured condition of the Jews in Ḥijāz is pointed out and utilized for his philosophy of history by Ibn Khaldūn (died 1406) in his *Prolegomena* II 212, 461.

¹¹⁰ Grätz I. I. 108.

¹¹¹ Cf. Lidzbarski, *De prophetis, quae dicuntur, legendis arabicis*, Leipzig 1893 p. 28 f.

¹¹² Cf. Geiger, *Was hat Muhammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen* p. 9 f. Different in character and origin was Southern Arabic or Ḥimyaric Judaism in Yemen, cf. Z. Frankel in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* II (1853) 451. On this Southern, probably non-Talmudic, Judaism see the second part of my article on 'Abdallah b. Sabā in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* vol. XXIV.

¹¹³ See my Note on "The Jews of Arabia and the Gaonate" in this volume.

adoption of "allegorical interpretation" has often led to libertinism or, as the Muhammedans call it, the "*istiḥlāl al-muḥarramāt*," "the permission of forbidden things."¹¹⁴ But it was a consequence, not a motive. A religion without definite religious obligations has few chances for becoming popular in the East. James Darmsteter¹¹⁵ is even of the opinion that the rapid conversion of the Persians from Zoroastrism to Islam was due to the fact that the former, with all its burdensome purification rites, "was on the other hand as hostile as possible to that spirit of asceticism which the people always love to see in their religion." Manichæism and Mazdakism, which arose as a protest against Zoroastrism, are decidedly ascetic, and the same ascetic spirit is characteristic of most Muhammedan heterodox sects. The same holds good in the case of Jewish sectarianism. The Karaite schism was, as Weiss¹¹⁶ has convincingly shown, not a protest against the restrictions of rabbinical tradition, but, on the contrary, against its alleviations. Early Karaism was strongly ascetic and so were the sects of Abū 'Īsa, Yūdḡān, and the like. And if it be admitted that the Arabian Jews gave birth to Jewish sectarianism, because, among other grievances, they found it difficult "to give up their drinking-bouts with the Arabs," they would indeed have made but a poor exchange: for Abū 'Īsa and Yūdḡān, among other ascetic restrictions, forbade the drinking of wine altogether.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ See *Shiites* Index s. v. *Precepts*. It must be borne in mind, however, that libertinism is a favorite, often unfounded charge against sectarians in all religions.

¹¹⁵ *Le Mahdi* p. 19 f., cf. also Browne l. l. p.

¹¹⁶ *Dor dor we-dorshow* IV⁴ 65.

¹¹⁷ See later.

The acceptance of a later date for the appearance of Abū ʿĪsa and his disciple Yūdḡān¹¹⁸ makes it highly improbable that the founder of Karaism who rose very soon afterwards should have been influenced by them to any appreciable extent. It is altogether difficult to assume that a man of the deep learning and the high social standing of Anan should have succumbed to the influence of these sectarians who were very ignorant¹¹⁹ and occupied a very low social position.¹²⁰ The character of this type of Jewish sectarianism and the Karaitic schism is indeed entirely different. Karaism is *anti-Talmudic*. It is based on a definite system of interpretation and presupposes a community of scholars and a highly developed Talmudic culture. The heterodoxy of Abū ʿĪsa and others like him is not directed against the Talmud. If we are to believe Ẹirḡisānī,¹²¹ Abū ʿĪsa placed the Rabbinical sages on almost the same level with the prophets.¹²² This heterodoxy affects likewise Biblical and Talmudical ordinances and has, besides, a strong Messianic character. As its bearers we have to picture to ourselves a community of simple-minded uneducated Jews, removed from the center of Talmudic learning and unable to grasp the intricacies of the Halakah, an easy prey to Messianic adventurers and the influences of the non-Jewish surroundings. The Karaitic secession therefore is an inner-Jewish movement. It owes the outside world nothing ex-

¹¹⁸ Yūdḡān is placed by Grätz (V³ 190, cf. 447) at 800. This is certainly too late. Yūdḡān who was Abū ʿĪsa's disciple must have succeeded his master immediately.

¹¹⁹ See *supra* p. 208.

¹²⁰ See later.

¹²¹ p. 311, 25.

¹²² This is meant by Hadassi when he clumsily says (p. 41^e) מעט דברי בני בי רב מחזיקים הם כנבואה. On the conception underlying this excessive veneration see later.

cept the general spirit of the age which, as a result of the mixture of cultures, was characterized by scepticism and a marked tendency to schism. Jewish sectarianism of the type of Abū 'Īsa, while retaining the main elements of Judaism, is deeply influenced by the non-Jewish environment and is indebted to it for many of its characteristics.

We will now proceed to examine these characteristics and to illustrate by some striking examples the rôle of Shiitic elements in Jewish sectarianism.

(To be continued)

THE INFLUENCE OF JEWISH LAW ON THE
DEVELOPMENT OF JURISPRUDENCE
IN THE CHRISTIAN ORIENT¹

BY V. APTOWITZER,

Israelitisch-theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna

JEWISH law, by which we mean the Mosaic code amplified and carried further at the hands of the Talmudic doctors and to a less extent by Karaitic scholars, has exerted a powerful influence on the development of jurisprudence in the Christian Orient. Whether in Babylonia, Armenia, Syria, or Northern Africa, Christian judges pronounced sentence on the basis of Mosaic-Talmudic statements of law, Christian jurists delivered opinions according to Biblical-Talmudic or Karaitic legal maxims, and Christian codifiers incorporated Jewish law in their law-books. This

¹ The above paper constitutes a summary of the contents of the writer's following publications:

Beiträge zur mosaïschen Rezeption im Armenischen Recht. Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Band 157. Hölder, Vienna 1907.

Zur Geschichte des armenischen Rechts. Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl., XXI. Hölder, Vienna 1907.

Die syrischen Rechtsbücher und das mosaïsch-talmudische Recht. Sitzungsberichte d. kais. Akademie, Band 163. Hölder, Vienna 1909.

In addition, comp. my essays "*Die Rechtsbücher der nestorianischen Patriarchen und ihre Quellen*," in: Anzeiger der Kais. Akad. in Wien, phil.-histor. Klasse, March 2, 1910; "*Die Rechtsbücher der syrischen Patriarchen*," WZKM., Oct. 1910, 1-45.

As the present paper is merely in the nature of a review, it has been considered unnecessary to incorporate references or citations for the examples adduced.

fact comes home to us on a perusal of the Christian legal literature of those countries as far as it has become accessible through publication. To be sure, the influence of Jewish law does not manifest itself in all these legal codes with the same directness and with the same lasting impact.

Relatively speaking, the influence of Jewish law is minimal in the so-called *Syro-Roman Code* which appears to have been influenced to a greater extent by the *Hammurabi Code*.² Nevertheless, even that code seems to contain more of Jewish elements than is commonly recognized; only the fact does not appear to stand out as clearly and unequivocally as in the other codes. Thus a goodly number of the many obscure and hitherto unexplained decisions of that code may go back to Mosaic-Talmudic maxims of law which, however, appear to have undergone modification, as may be shown by the following example.

Syro-Roman Code, L. § 36: "When a man has two wives, one without *φερνή* and she bears him children, and another married legally, and she likewise bears him children, whether they all inherit equally?—The man may cause them to inherit equally, by designating them, the children of the wife without *φερνή*, as *strangers*, strange heirs, and, though *he call them not his children*, nevertheless by indicating his intention that they should inherit together with his children". Bruns and Mitteis are at a loss to explain on the basis of *Roman* law this curious decision

² D. H. Müller was the first to establish the Semitic element in the Syro-Roman Code. Comp. his *Gesetze Hammurabis*, 275-285; *Das syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch und Hammurabi*, Vienna 1905. Müller's arguments have been accepted *in toto* by Josef Kohler, and supplemented with reference to Talmudic law by myself. Comp. my review in this *QUARTERLY*, 1907, 605-611, and *Die syrischen Rechtsbücher*, *passim*.

that the illegitimate children may inherit only as strangers and not as children. It is likewise diametrically opposed to the laws of Hammurabi according to which illegitimate children may inherit only when they have been legally adopted as children. D. H. Müller, it is true, has ingeniously endeavored to remove this discrepancy, but his explanation is not altogether satisfactory, especially for the reason that we meet with this peculiar principle also in a case which has nothing whatsoever to do with *illegitimate* children. In the Old Armenian Code of Mechitar Gosh we read: "The daughter's son, however, does not inherit and receives no portion, unless the testator have appointed him heir during his life-time in writing, for a man's seed is indeed his daughter, but not his daughter's son. The same holds good of the step-child. A man, however, has the power, when he so desires, to appoint such as *heirs during his life-time*, to wit, *as strangers*". I have no doubt whatsoever that the peculiar aspect of this decision is due solely to its phraseology; so far as its contents go, it is identical with the following paragraph of the Mishna: "Whoso distributes his property orally (in a dying condition), assigning to the one heir more, to the other less, or placing them on an equal footing with the first-born, his words are *valid*. But when these assignments are made in the form of inheritance, he has said nothing (his words are *not valid*)". In a briefer and terser form the Tosefta: "When any one says, 'N. N. shall be my *heir*', he has said nothing; (when he says,) '*Bestow my property as a gift upon N. N.*', *his words are valid*". That is to say, one may transfer his property to such as *have no legal claim* in the form of *gifts*, but not as *inheritance*. This differentiation between a gift and a legacy corresponds in the Syro-Roman

Code and in the Old Armenian Code to the difference between *strangers* upon whom *gifts* may be *bestowed* and children who inherit.

The Mosaic-Talmudic law makes itself felt in a particularly emphatic manner and with an import which is unique in the history of jurisprudence in *Armenian law* as it has come down to us in the three Armenian codes: the Old Armenian Code of the Bishop Mechitar Gosh of the twelfth century, the Middle Armenian Code of Sempad of the thirteenth century, and the Polish-Armenian Code. Here it is not a question of *single* legal decisions and *single* legal maxims in which the influence of Jewish law becomes apparent; Mechitar Gosh on whose code the two other Armenian codes are constructed has directly taken over a large portion of the laws in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, and that in the *order* and to a large extent also in the *language* of the original. And where the language of the original has not been preserved it is due to the circumstance that a considerably large portion of the Mosaic material in the code of Mechitar Gosh appears not in its original Biblical form, but in the modified form resulting from the Talmudic tradition and interpretation.

The fact that Mosaic law has been taken over into Armenian law has been pointed out by F. Bischoff in his fundamental work on Armenian law. To a still larger degree it has been recognized by J. Kohler. Kohler and after him J. Karst, the editor, translator, and commentator of the Armenian code of laws, have also recognized and emphasized that Talmudic-Rabbinic influence makes itself particularly felt in the Old Armenian Code of Mechitar Gosh of the twelfth century. But it has been reserved for

D. H. Müller and myself to prove the singular magnitude and potency of the Talmudic-Rabbinic influence on the Code of Mechitar. A further result of my own investigations has been the knowledge that the more recent redaction of the Mechitar code, the code of Sempad and the Polish-Armenian code, even where they are at variance with Gosh, have been markedly influenced by Talmudic law.

Müller's work has been reviewed by me in volume XIX of this *QUARTERLY* (pp. 611-614). On the present occasion I may be permitted to single out from my investigations a few examples:

1. Gosh's Dastanagirk, II 48:

"Law concerning incendiaries.—When a house is set on fire through a voluntary act and the incendiary is caught, the following case is to be distinguished: When human beings^s perish in the fire, let painful punishment be inflicted upon his hand, *although according to law he is guilty of death*, in order that thereby the way to eventual repentance may be left open to him."

Now, the Mosaic law knows neither of arson committed on dwellings nor of death caused by incendiarism. The latter case, however, is met with in Talmudic law, though not quite in Mechitar's sense, and there indeed the penalty for such a crime is death. Gosh, however, knows this legal matter as Mosaic, for such is the meaning which he always associates with the term "law". Thus for Gosh *Talmudic* law was *Mosaic* law. The explanation for that is the fact that Gosh derived his Mosaic law not directly from the Pentateuch, but from compendia of the Pentateuch which, in the case of many laws, contained the rabbinic interpretation and even independent talmudic decisions.

2. Gosh's Dastanagirk, II 9:

Law pertaining to drunkards and to injuries done by them.—As for an injury committed in a state of drunkenness, no mitigation of the penalty is to be allowed according to our ecclesiastical law.

On which Karst remarks: "The legal principle..... goes back to *Can. 7 of Saint Sahak*..... That the same ran counter to *Armenian customary law* which apparently to the same extent as the *Græco-Roman law* allowed a plea for mitigation of the penalty on the ground of irresponsibility, follows with certainty from the emphatic manner in which it becomes necessary in the paragraph in question to secure the acceptance of this legal maxim, which can only be explained on the supposition that this maxim was not the current one".

The maxim of Saint Sahak referred to above which runs counter both to the Armenian customary law and the Græco-Roman law agrees in every respect with Talmudic law whence it has therefore been derived.

3. Dat., II 23 (Karst, p. 199): "Law concerning them that smite their father or their mother.—He that smiteth his father or his mother, shall be surely put to death (Exod. 21, 15). So according to law".

In a more recent version (488 749, Sin.) this chapter reads as follows:

"Concerning the reviling of one's father or mother. In the case of reviling, the law confers upon the father the authority to bring his son before the judge: if he confess his guilt and relapse not, he shall be rebuked and let go free; otherwise he shall be punished according to law, for according to the ancient law it was customary to hang him that reviled his father or his mother".

In the case of reviling one's parents the "law" has nothing to say about taking the son before the judge. This point is derived from the law concerning the rebellious son (Deut. 21, 18-21). There, however, according to the tenor of the text, the elders (judges) step in only when the rebuke (chastening) has remained ineffective, and then it is for the purpose of pronouncing sentence of death. The judges have nothing to do with the chastening itself which is the business of the parents. Thus also is the passage in question reproduced in Dat., II 70 (Karst, p. 199).

It is also strange that here the *judges* are spoken of and not, as in the Bible and in Dat. (II 23 and 70), the *elders*.

But particularly remarkable is the statement: "for according to the ancient (scil. the Mosaic) law it was customary to hang him that reviled his father or his mother". In the Bible we read merely: "shall be surely put to death"; the manner of death is not indicated.

Now, all this receives its explanation from the fact that we have before us in this variation of the original code one of the most interesting cases of borrowing from Talmudical literature.

That we are to understand by the expression "and though they chasten him" in the case of the rebellious son not, as is warranted by the context, parental reprimand, but judicial punishment by stripes, the Talmud infers by analogy from Deut. 22, 18, where we read of the slanderer of his wife: "and chastise him", by which expression punishment by stripes is meant. And in the Mishna (Sanhedrin 71 a) we read of the rebellious son: "He is warned in the presence of three men and is given the punishment of stripes (in the presence of three men). If he then sin again, he is taken before a court of law consisting of

twenty-three members". Hence, the later version of Dat., II 23, has applied not the *Biblical*, but the *Talmudic* law concerning the rebellious son to that pertaining to the reviler.

Now, the crime of reviling one's parents is punished according to the Talmud by *strangling*. This point was taken over by our version, except that it replaced the penalty of *strangling* peculiar to Talmudic penology by a *similar* penalty with which Armenian law was more familiar, hanging.

In its purely formal aspect we find it strange that in this later version of Dat., II 23, the law concerning reviling one's parents is brought into connection with a paragraph concerning the case "when children commit unlawful acts against *third* persons". In Dat. and the Code of Sempad we find nothing of the sort, whereas in our version we read immediately after the paragraph dealing with the reviling of one's parents as follows: "On the other hand, as for unlawful acts committed by children against third persons, in this case the law does not confer authority upon the father to indict his sons before the judge".

An explanation of the reason why these two paragraphs are connected is readily afforded by the circumstance that in the Mishna we find beside the regulation mentioned above concerning the rebellious son the following paragraph: "*When he steals from strangers and consumes what he has stolen in a locality belonging to strangers, (when he steals) from strangers and consumes in a locality belonging to his father, he is not dealt with after the manner of a rebellious son; (that is the case) only when he steals from his father and consumes in a locality belonging to a stranger*" .

Since our version took over the *one* regulation of the Mishna, it took over at the same time also the *other* regulation, giving it the form of a general principle that parents have no right of indicting their children in the case of unlawful acts committed by them against third persons.

To a similar degree the influence of Jewish law is manifested in the Syriac codes of three Catholic patriarchs of the Eastern Nestorian Church, edited by Eduard Sachau. All these three patriarchs belong to Islamic times and lived and held office in *Babylonia*. The oldest of them, Henanisho Xenias, was in office as patriarch from 686 to 701 in Seleucia on the Tigris, in Arabic Elmadā'in. The two later patriarchs, Timothy and Jesubarnun, lived in the first quarter of the ninth century. Their official seat was *Bagdad*, the residence of the caliphs.

Henanisho appears in the capacity of *judge*. He communicates directions in answer to questions submitted to him by subordinate judges, and in his function as supreme judge he reverses judgments passed by magistrates subject to his control. We have 25 documents, *judgments*, coming from him. On the other hand, his two successors were real codifiers of law. Timothy wrote a code consisting of 99 paragraphs which in the main deal with the law of marriage and inheritance. The code of Jesubarnun contains 130 paragraphs of which more than one-half (71) treats of the law of marriage (32 paragraphs) and the law of inheritance (39 paragraphs). The remaining 59 paragraphs contain regulations concerning ecclesiastic law, ecclesiastic and monastic discipline (24 paragraphs), the law of slaves (7 paragraphs), and other questions of law.

Not a word is said by the patriarchs concerning their sources. We naturally first think of *Islamic* influence.

But in the legislation of our patriarchs there is not the slightest trace of Islamic law. For that we have the testimony of so thorough a student of Mohammedan law as E. Sachau. Likewise, there is extremely little of *Græco-Roman* law to be found in the codes of laws by the Nestorian patriarchs. On the other hand, my investigations have resulted in proving that the *Jewish law* was the common source for Henanisho, Timothy, and Jesubarnun.

I may be permitted to single out just one point, the *law of inheritance*. The latter agrees in the codes of Timothy and Jesubarnun wholly with the Jewish system of inheritance, with this difference that in two points Timothy is at variance with *Talmudic* law and adheres to the Sadduceo-Karaitic opinions, whereas the system of inheritance propounded by Jesubarnun absolutely coincides with the *Talmudic* order of succession:

Talmudic law of inheritance	Timothy	Jesubarnun
1. sons (not daughters)	1. sons (not daughters)	1. sons (not daughters)
2. descendants of the sons	2. descendants of the sons	2. descendants of the sons
3. daughters	3. daughters	3. daughters
4. descendants of the daughters	4. descendants of the daughters	4. descendants of the daughters
5. father (not mother)	5. father and mother	5. [father] (not mother)
6. brothers	6. brothers (not sisters)	6. brothers
7. descendants of the brothers	7. descendants of the brothers	7. descendants of the brothers
8. sisters	8. sisters	8. [sisters]
9. descendants of the sisters	9. descendants of the sisters	9. [descendants of the sisters]

10. the father's brothers	10. the father's brothers	10. the father's brothers
11. descendants of the father's brothers	11. descendants of the father's brothers	11. descendants of the father's brothers
12. the father's sis- ters	12. the father's sis- ters	12. [the father's sis- ters]
13. descendants of the father's sis- ters	13. descendants of the father's sis- ters	13. [descendants of the father's sis- ters]
14. the mother's kin excluded	14. the mother's kin	14. the mother's kin excluded

I have been in a position to sum up the result of my investigation of the codes of the three Nestorian patriarchs in the following statement:

The legal decisions of the *catholicos* Mar Hēnanisho, the patriarch of the East, agree in the greatest number of instances entirely with the Talmudic law and *only* with that. The differences that subsist between the two have their analogies in Sadduceo-Karaitic traditions and in opinions of Talmudic authorities not accepted. At all events it is with *Jewish* legal principles and maxims alone that the judicial opinions of the patriarchs agree to so remarkable an extent; if we leave them out of account, many of these opinions would remain quite obscure and beyond explanation.

If we did not know that these judicial opinions emanate from a Syrian *catholicos* we might be tempted to look upon them as a code of responsa by a Talmudist with Karaitic leanings from the gaonic academies of Sora and Pumbeditha. Since, however, it is a Syrian patriarch that shows so thorough a knowledge of Talmudic law and Talmudic tradition, the phenomenon can be explained only by the as-

sumption that the patriarch did not merely casually associate with Jewish scholars, but rather had Jewish scholars as teachers and constant mentors.

The "Canons and Laws of the pious man of God Monsignor Timothy the *Catholicos*" agree in the greatest number of cases with the Talmudic law and in part can be explained only from that source. The agreements are to a large extent so remarkable that it is impossible to explain them as sheer casual coincidences; nor would it be sufficient to say that they point merely to an *influence* exerted by Talmudic law. We are constrained to assume in this instance *direct borrowing*. Several even of the discrepancies between the decisions of the *catholicos* and Talmudic law, indeed, can *only* be explained by legal principles which have come down in the Talmudic literature and in it *only*, though these ideas have not been raised to the dignity of legal norms. The influence of Talmudic law or, to speak more generally, of Talmudic literature shows itself with still greater potency in the code of the *catholicos* Timothy than in the legal decisions of the patriarch Henanisho. Hence, if any one it must have been Timothy that had Jewish scholars as teachers and mentors.

The influence of Jewish law and Jewish literature shows itself also in the code of Jesubarnun, though not with the same potency as in the works of Henanisho and Timothy, still potently enough that it can be demonstrated that even a man of the type of Jesubarnun who if anything was unfriendly to the Jews could not emancipate himself from the influence of his Jewish environment.

I have endeavored to show that, so far as Armenia is concerned, one of the moments favoring the infiltration of Mosaic-Talmudic legal norms and principles into the legal

practice of the Armenians was the intercourse and the relations between the Jewish and Armenian population. This moment is of still greater import with reference to Babylonia. In Babylonia, intercourse between Jews and Christians was much closer and the relation of the two strata of population to each other still more intimate than in Armenia.

We learn from Timothy and Jesubarnun that in many a district of Babylonia circumcision, and that "after the Jewish fashion", was customary among the Christian population.

Instances of friendship between Jews and Christians are attested by Jesubarnun.

Several of Jesubarnun's decisions go to show that *Jews and Christians were in the habit of contracting intermarriages*, and that *without the removal of the "impedimentum disparitatis cultus."*

A further point is that, as in Armenia, there was wanting a uniformed national system of laws.

POETIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE GENIZAH

BY ISRAEL DAVIDSON,

Jewish Theological Seminary of America

II. FROM A DIVAN OF A NORTH AFRICAN POET

THIS fragment, likewise from the T-S. Collection (LOAN No. 58), consists of the two outer leaves of a parchment quire making four pages of 23 x 16 c. m., with 30 lines to each page, excepting the first, which has only 28. The writing is square in character, with a slight tendency towards the cursive. The manuscript is defective in several places, and between p. 2 and 3 there is a gap, perhaps of several leaves, which accounts for the fragmentary state of some of the poems. In the manuscript, the poems are not written in verse form, nor are they punctuated. Only here and there occur some diacritical signs and these are indicated in my notes.

With the exception of the first poem, which is a love quatrain, the fifth, which is too fragmentary, and the third and eighth which give us no clue to the people to whom they were addressed, the remaining four poems seem to possess genuine historical interest in addition to their literary value. Thus, from the second poem, which is addressed to Abraham Ibn 'Atā, we gather fresh information about this important personage of Kairwan. That Ibn 'Atā played an important rôle in his day, first became known to us through a poem of Hai Gaon, discovered by

Harkavy and published in the Hebrew periodical "Haze-firah", XXVI (May 10, 1899), col. 484c-485a, by David Magid (צפוני מערבי). In this poem, which must have formed the introductory part of a longer letter, the Gaon speaks of Ibn 'Atā in terms of the highest esteem, and, the scribe who copied it in 1120, as the editor informs us, describes him as the Nagid of Kairwan. Lately, again, Professor Goldziher and Dr. Poznański have expressed the view that this Ibn 'Atā, the correspondent of Hai Gaon, is identical with the physician Abū Ishāk Mar R. Abraham b. Mar R. 'Atā mentioned with great respect in an anonymous Arabic treatise on the Attributes of God. Professor Goldziher finds in verses 7 (not 6) and 18 of Hai's poem convincing proof that Hai's correspondent was a physician (*Harkavy-Festschrift*, p. 100). While the identity is not improbable, it is, nevertheless, strange that our North African poet, in sounding the praises of Ibn 'Atā, makes no mention whatever of his medical skill. Furthermore, I venture to say, that these verses (7 and 18) give us no clue to the profession of Ibn 'Atā. The fact is that the editor of the poem has failed to make its import clear to us, as he also overlooked the fact that it is written in meter. I consider it, therefore, advisable to reproduce here the poem of Hai, especially since it was printed in a daily and is therefore not easily accessible. Of course, a number of passages must remain obscure on account of the state of the manuscript and more so because the original is inaccessible to me and I have to rely on the printed text which may perhaps contain printer's errors in addition. The meaning and purpose of the poem, however, will, I trust, become clearer from the few corrections I have been able to make.

מכאתבה רבינו הא"י נאון לר' אברהם בן עטא נגיד אלקירואן.

- 1 — — — — — | — — — — —
- 1 הַנִּמְצָא לְהוֹרָאָה² תְּמוּנָה וּמִרְאָה
לְשׁוֹמוֹ לְנִגְדָה בִּיפּוֹ כְּאִישׁ יֵאָה³ !
- 2 וְלוֹ נִמְצָאָה עָמִי יְכוּלָה לְהַעֲרָה⁴
סְתוּרֵי לִבִּי נִחַפְּשׁוּ⁵ לָךְ לְהוֹרָאָה⁶
- 3 וְלוֹ נִחַלְקָה⁷ רוּחִי לְעַמְדָה לְנִגְדָה
מִהָרָה שְׁלַחְתִּיהָ לְעוֹפֶף כְּאִישׁ דּוֹאָה⁸
- 4 לְגִלְתִּי⁹ צְפוּנִיָּה בָּהּ¹⁰ בִּי אֲנִי לָךְ¹¹
מִקּוֹה וּמִתְאַוָּה וְשׂוֹאָה¹² וּמִשְׁתַּאָּה,
- 5 וְהַמִּית חֲבִי¹³ לִבִּי לְשִׁמְךָ לְזִכְרָךְ
כְּנֻנָן בְּכִנּוּרֹךְ מִתּוֹפֶף וְלֹא לֹאָה¹⁴.
- 6 חֲבִי אֶת יַחֲדִיד עָמִי¹⁵ אֲסִירִים לְשַׁלַּח
וְלַגְעוֹר¹⁶ בְּמִרְהֶבֶת¹⁷ מִשְׁחִץ¹⁸ וּמִתְנַאָּה
- 7 מִרְפָּא שְׁבוּרֵי¹⁹ לֵב מִחֲבֹשׁ לְעַצְבָּם²⁰
וּמִטִּי אֵלַי הָרָג²¹ מַחִיָּה וְלֵב כּוֹאָה²²,
- 8 וּמִי יִשְׁוֶה²³ אוֹ מִי יִדְמָה לְנִגְדָה,

¹ A modified form of the Tawil. ² Edition reads להוראה.

³ = becoming. ⁴ Cf. Lev. 20, 18.

⁵ Obad. 1, 6.

⁶ Hofal of ראה. Cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, s. v. ראה. Ed. reads להראה.

⁷ Cf. Gen. 49, 7.

⁸ Cf. Deut. 28, 49.

⁹ Ed. reads לגלה.

¹⁰ = concerning thee. Cf. Num. 12, 1.

¹¹ Ed. reads לה.

¹² Cf. Ps. 65, 8.

¹³ Cf. Job 31, 33.

¹⁴ Cf. Job 4, 2.

¹⁵ Cf. Gen. 27, 36. הכי קרא שמו יעקב.

¹⁶ Ed. reads ולגעור.

¹⁷ Cf. Isa. 51, 9.

¹⁸ Cf. Job 28, 5.

¹⁹ Ed. reads שברי.

²⁰ Cf. Ps. 147, 3. Ed. reads לעצבה.

²¹ Prov. 24, 11.

²² = נכאה Ps. 109, 16.

²³ = ישוה לך.

- וּמִי יַעֲזֹר כַּח לְפָנִים לְהִתְרַאֵה
 9 לְמִי בַחֲסִדִּיהַּ בְּכָל־מַעֲרֵכֵי אוֹם,²⁴
 וּמִי לוֹ²⁵ כְּשִׁמְךָ הַמַּעֲוִלָה וְהַנָּאָה.
 10 וּמִי יֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר יֵשָׂא לְבָבוֹ וַיַּעֲנֶה
 כִּמּוֹ זֶה, בְּקִצּוֹי הָאֲדָמָה? ²⁶ אֲמֹר לוֹ אִי
 11 וַחֲטוֹי²⁷ גְּדוֹלוֹת מַעֲשֵׂיהַּ וַחֲסִדִּיהַּ
 אֲתֵנָה²⁸ וּבָךְ²⁹ אֲשָׂא מִשְׁלִי וְאֶקְרָאָה
 12 וְאִיכָה שְׂכַחַתִּנִּי וְגִדְלִי זְרוּעָה
 עָלַי גַּם רְחוּקָה וְאוֹלָף גַּם מוֹאֵה³⁰
 13 וְאַחֵר נִשְׁדוֹנִי הֲלֹא בִמְחֹזֶה לָךְ³¹
 לְבֹא מִרְדִּידִיךָ³² לְשַׁכְּמִי לְהִתְנַאֵה
 14 וַיְדִי בַחֲשֵׁשָׁה³³ וַיְמִי בַיִּשְׁשׁוֹ³⁴
 וַעֲיִנִּי בַעֲשֻׁשָׁה³⁵ מְאֹדָה וְהִרְזָאָה³⁶
 15 וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּחוּ מִנִּי קְדוּמִי³⁷ אֲמַתִּיךָ
 בַּסִּמְכִי עָלַי מְלִיכָה בַּשְׁכִּתָּךְ בַּפּוֹלִיָּא.³⁸

²⁴ Ed. reads לאום against the meter.

²⁵ Ed. reads לוֹ.

²⁶ This phrase depends upon וּמִי יֵשׁ.

²⁷ The meaning is not clear. The editor's emendation און וחטאיה is not clearer and is against the meter.

²⁸ Judg. 5, 11.

²⁹ = ועליך. Ed. reads ובו.

³⁰ I fail to understand this phrase.

³¹ Read perhaps: וְאַחֵר נִשְׁיִתֵּנִי הֲלֹא בִמְחֹזֶה לָךְ, i. e. "even though you have forgotten me I still waited for thee".

³² Cf. Cant. 5, 7. ³³ = כאלו תשש כחה.

³⁴ = כאלו יששו; cf. Job 12, 12.

³⁵ = כאלו עששה; cf. Ps. 6, 8.

³⁶ = sight, synonym for עיני. Cf. Eccl. 12, 3 הראות.

³⁷ Modifies אמתִיךָ, i. e. your former kindness.

³⁸ = Apulia. See Rapoport, ערך מלין, 179, and his reference to the

- 16 הִנָּהּ בָּךְ לִפְנוֹת ⁴⁰ לְדַבְרֵי מְרִשְׁלִי
 יְדֵי מַחְזִיקֵי דַת תְּעוּדָה לְהִיפָאָה ⁴¹
 17 וְאַתָּה נָקִי לִכְבֹּב בְּיוֹשֶׁר וְתָם לֵב ⁴²
 לְמַנְעָה ⁴³ נִדְבָה מִמַּחֲבָה ⁴⁴ וּמִתִּיָּאָה ?
 18 עָשָׂה לְמַחֲכִים לָךְ כְּדָרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ ⁴⁵
 וְאַל תַּחֲשֶׂה בְּדַבָּר מְרִבָּה וּמִתְלָאָה ⁴⁶
 19 לְסִדְרֵי כְּנִישָׁאֲתָא שְׁבַחְךָ נְהִיָּא ⁴⁷
 בְּקוֹשְׁטָא וּבְקַהֲל כְּהֵנִיא וְלוֹוִיָּא ⁴⁸
 20 נִגִּידָא דְעַמּוּיִן וְרִישָׁא דְסִדְרֵיהֶן ⁴⁹
 וְרַבָּא וְסִלְרִיא ⁵⁰ דְסַאבֵי יְהוּדָאֵי.

Examining the poem carefully, it must become evident that verse 7 is only an echo of the Psalmist and has no reference to physical healing. If the latter had been intended by the Gaon, he would have used the expression *ומטים אלי הרג*. The expression *ומטים אלי מות* rather conveys the idea that Ibn 'Atā saved one from the gallows (comp. *לשלח* אסירים in verse 6). Similarly, there is no

Midrash. Ed. reads *מילת בשבתי בפילאי*.

³⁹ In the ed. this word is in the preceding verse and reads *ינאה*.

⁴⁰ Ed. reads *לפניה*.

⁴¹ The meaning is not clear.

⁴² Ed. reads *לך*.

⁴³ Like *לפנות* this verb also depends on *בך הנהה* in verse 16.

⁴⁴ Ed. reads *ממחבה*.

⁴⁵ Dan. 13, 12.

⁴⁶ Mal. 1, 13; ed. reads *מרפה ותתלאה*.

⁴⁷ Dan. 2, 7. ⁴⁸ Ezra 6, 16.

⁴⁹ Ed. reads *כסדריהן*.

⁵⁰ Cf. Jastrow, s. v. *סלרין*; ed. reads *וסלרא*. Poznański (אנשי קירואן) *47*) reads *וסלרא* or *וסלירא*. and derives its meaning from *σελλάριον chair*. Though the first occurs also in a letter of Hai to Judah b. Joseph (Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 278), it is excluded by the meter which requires here a word of three syllables. The second reading is possible, but the meaning of "chair" gives no sense to the passage.

reference whatever to medicine in verse 18. The purpose of the letter seems to be beyond all doubt that of engaging the sympathies of Ibn 'Atā in the interest of the Babylonian schools. Like the letter of Sherira (Schechter, *Saadyana*, 118 ff.) and the letter of Hai to Judah b. Joseph (Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 277 ff.) this letter to Ibn 'Atā must have been a plea for the support of the old center of Jewish learning. Verse 16 seems to hint at the opponents of the school, and in the following two verses the Gaon implores Ibn 'Atā to deal justly with those who have placed their hope in him. That Ibn 'Atā lent his support to the Babylonian Academies is also indicated in the phrase *מחוק ידי ברק*, which our North African poet applies to him (see below No. 2, l. 33). If the emendation in verse 15 is justified, then Ibn 'Atā resided at one time in Apulia which is one more proof of the relationship between Italy and Kairwan as well as Babylonia (See Schechter, *A Letter of Chushiel*, *JQR.*, XI, 645; Kaufmann, *GGA.*, 1886, 74-75; Poznański, *שונים ענינים*, 64). Our North African poet furnishes us with one more interesting point. In lines 35 and 50 Ibn 'Atā is spoken of as the son of Nathan. It seems therefore possible that our Abraham ben Nathan Ibn 'Atā is identical with Abraham b. Nathan mentioned in the letter of Hushiel together with Judah Resh Kallah and Joseph b. Berachiah (*JQR.*, XI, 645, and 650, l. 71; Poznański, *אנשי קירואן*, No. 6 and 7). Finally, from the superscription of our poem, we also learn that Ibn 'Atā had a brother-in-law by the name of Isma'il Ibn Nabat, regarding whom nothing further is known at present.

In the second poem (No. 4) addressed to Ibn 'Atā, we find that our poet calls him friend and master (עטא אחי)

The third man to be extolled in verse by our poet is David Ibn Bibas, a liturgical poet himself, of whose writings only one specimen is known to be preserved in an old Karaite Prayer Book (Pinsker, לקוטי קרמוניות, 138). From the fragmentary state of our poem (No. 7) it is impossible to form any definite opinion in regard to Ibn Bibas, but since our poet calls him "a son of perfect fear" (l. 9), it is safe to assume that he was not a Karaite though Pinsker considered him as such (*ibid.*, note 6).

The identity of the author of these eight poems cannot be ascertained at present. But since some of them were addressed to men of Kairwan, who flourished about the end of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh, and since the poet seems to speak of Ibn 'Atā as his friend and master, it is safe to assume that he was at least a native of North Africa, if not of Kairwan, and an older contemporary of Samuel Hanagid and Solomon Ibn Gabirol.

.....וקאל מתגולא

.1

(A Ghazal)

51 — — — — —

כֹּאֵיל לַחֲזוֹת עֵינִי כְּבוֹדָה ⁵²	בַּעַת חֶשֶׁק... אֶדְלֵג
וְאִבִּיהָ וְאֶחָיָה וְדוֹדָה	וְאִבּוֹאָה וְהֵן אִמָּה לְנִגְדָה
כֹּאֵלֹו לֹא אֲנִי רִיעָה יְדִידָה	אֲשׁוּר־נָה וְאִפְנֶה לְאַחֲרִי
כָּלֵב אִשָּׁה מִשְׁפָּלֶת יְחִידָה	יֵרָא מֵהֶם, ⁵³ וְעֹלִיָה לִבִּבִי

⁵¹ The meter is a modified form of the Hazag. Cf. Brody, *Studien zu den Dichtungen Jehuda ha-Levi's*, 31a.

⁵² Ps. 45, 14.

⁵³ Cf. Ps. 3, 7.

2. וכתב לאברהם בן עטא יום נזולה אלי ערס צהרה אסמעיל אבן נבאת

54 — — — — —

לִבְבִי מֵאֲרָעִי בִזְכֹּר⁵⁵ וּמִבְחֲנִי⁵⁶ I

וְדָתִי תִלְאֲוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר זֶה⁵⁷ מִזְמִנִי⁵⁸

וְעֵשֶׂק זְמַנִּי לֹא אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה עִמּוֹ

בְּכָל-יָוִם לְהַשְׁפִּילוֹ,⁵⁹ בְּאֵיבָה כְּמִשְׁטִינִי⁶⁰

בְּאֲכָלוֹ⁶¹ כְּמוֹ אֲרֵבָה לִשְׂאֹל⁶² וְהוּא נִרְעָב 5

לְעַמּוֹ⁶³ וּבִנְשָׂאָר יִבְקֹשׁ נֶתֶן עֵינָיו⁶⁴

חֲדַל לֶךְ לִבְבִּי, אֶל תִּדְבֵּר בִּזְאת פִּוְעָה⁶⁵

אֲמוֹנָה, וְאַל תִּירָא וּשְׁמַע בְּקוֹל אֲזִנִּי⁶⁶

הַתְּשִׁים לִבְבָּךְ אֶל זְמַן רַע אֲשֶׁר לַחֲמוֹ

מִמָּלָא⁶⁷ מִרְרוֹתָיו וְרוֹשׁוֹ⁶⁸ מִסֶּךָ יֵינִי 10

מִדְבַּר וְאִין מְקִים⁶⁹ וְנֹדֵד וַיֵּשׁ עֵתוֹת

מִשְׁלָם, וְאִין דְּבַר מִדְבַּר עַל[?] אֲפִנִי⁷⁰?

⁵⁴ This meter is called the Tawil, cf. Brody, *ibid.*, 26.

⁵⁵ = לִבְבִּי ... זֹכֵר, i. e. the infinitive is used here in the sense of the present indicative. The whole clause is therefore declarative and not conditional.

⁵⁶ On the use of מִבְחֲנִי see Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, 105. MS. reads וּמִבְחֲוִנִי.

⁵⁷ Gen. 27, 36.

⁵⁸ = מִזְמִנִּים לוֹ.

⁵⁹ Cf. Hosea 9, 14.

⁶⁰ The two words ב' כ' relate to עִמּוֹ. MS. reads כְּמִשְׁטִינִי.

⁶¹ = בְּאֲכָלוֹ, cf. Mal. 1, 7. 12 באֲמָרְכֶם.

⁶² = To destroy it. Cf. Isa. 6, 11.

⁶³ = לְעַמּוֹתוֹ, cf. Filipowski, *מחברת מנחם*, 134, s. v. עַם, No. 4.

⁶⁴ Gen. 38, 9. Fate is devouring for the mere pleasure of destroying, while the poet is allowed to suffer hunger in its presence. Furthermore fate begrudges the poet even that which it cannot devour.

⁶⁵ Cf. Job 35, 16. MS. reads וּפְעָה.

⁶⁶ I fail to find the correct meaning of this phrase.

⁶⁷ Cf. Cant. 5, 14. ⁶⁸ Deut. 32, 32.

⁶⁹ Instead of מְקִים because of the meter.

⁷⁰ Prov. 25, 11. MS. reads מִדְּוֵבֵר עַל אֲפִנִי.

וְמִי זֶה אֲשֶׁר יִבְטַח עָדִי כִּי יִהְיֶה נִסְמָךְ
 עָלַי זֶה וַיַּעֲזֹב⁷¹ צוּר וּמִשְׁעָן לְנִשְׁעָנָיו ?
 [לֵה] שֶׁר⁷² אָבוֹ אִסְחָק, גִּבְרִי, אֲשֶׁר נֹדַע
 בְּאַפְסֵי אֲרָצוֹת עַם⁷³ רְחוֹקִים בְּמִשְׁכְּנָיו,⁷⁴
 בְּחֶסֶד⁷⁵ וַיֵּרֶאֶת אֶל וְשׁוֹעַ⁷⁶ וּפְתַחֲוֹן כָּף
 וְשֵׁם טוֹב וּמַעֲשֵׂי טוֹב;⁷⁷ אֲשֶׁר הוּא יִסּוֹר בְּזַנְיוֹ⁷⁸
 מֵאַחֲזוֹ⁷⁹ שְׂבִיל יוֹשֶׁר וְהוֹלֵךְ נְתִיב בּוֹשֶׁר⁸⁰
 וַיִּטּוֹשׁ⁸¹ כְּמוֹ נֶשֶׁר בְּחֶפְצוֹ וּבְרִצּוֹנָיו,
 וַיֵּרֶא, מְבַבֵּד אֶת־יְרִיאָיו וְבֵר לֵבָב
 נָקִי כָּף שֹׁפֵל רוּחַ וְעָנָיו כְּמוֹ עָנָיו;⁸²
 אֲשֶׁר חָס עָלָי עֲמוֹ בְּשׁוּרוֹ רַפּוֹת⁸³ יָדָיו
 וְהָיָה כְּמַגִּדֵּל עֹז לְדָלָיו וְאֲבִיוֹנָיו;
 עֲשִׂירֵיו כְּמוֹ אָבִיו יִכְבֵּד וְגַם אִמּוֹ
 וַיַּחְמֹל עָלָי דָּלָיו חֲמוֹל אִישׁ עָלָי בְּנִי
 יִסּוֹכֶךְ בְּאַבְרָתוֹ עֲלֵיהֶם עָדִי יֹאמַר
 נְשִׂיא עַם וְמִי יִתֵּן הַיּוֹתוֹ כְּמִסְכְּנָיו;

15

20

25

⁷¹ Instead of וַיַּעֲזֹב because of the meter.

⁷² From this line to the end of line 40 is one complex relative clause modifying the verb in line 41.

⁷³ Cf. I Sam. 16, 12 אֲדַמּוֹנִי עִם יִפְהָ עֵינָיִם.

⁷⁴ = Abu Ishak is known even to those who are far from his abode.

For this use of the ב cf. Gen. 13, 2. MS. reads בְּבִשְׁכְּנָיו.

⁷⁵ Cf. Deut. 24, 16 בַּחֲטָאוֹ. ⁷⁶ Isa. 32, 5.

⁷⁷ For the use of מַעֲשֵׂי see Zunz, S. P., 407.

⁷⁸ = Abu Ishak is the corner stone of his people's edifice. In contrast to this expression cf. אֲבֵן מַאֲסוֹ הַבּוֹנִים Ps. 118, 22.

⁷⁹ Job 26, 9. ⁸⁰ Pesahim 83a.

⁸¹ Cf. Job 9, 26. MS. reads טָם, it may therefore point to the reading of וְטָם.

⁸² Cf. Num. 12, 3.

⁸³ Cf. רִשּׁוֹת.

נָדִיב לֵב אֲשֶׁר אֵין יָם בֵּעַת יִהְיוּ גִלְיוֹ
 וְלֹא מִי שֶׁחָקִים עֵת יִרְקוֹן , כְּמִתְנִי;⁸⁴ 30
 אֲשֶׁר אֵין בְּאוֹצְרוֹ מִסָּנֶר,⁸⁵ וְלֹא חוֹתֶם
 בְּבִיסוֹ, וְלֹא אוֹמֵר בְּפֶה ל... בְּקִנְיָנו;⁸⁶
 מִכֶּלֶה לְכָל־חֶדֶק מִחֶזֶק יְדֵי בְּדֶק
 אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲשׂוֹת צֶדֶק זָמְמוּ וַחֲשַׁבּוּנוּ;
 גְּבִירִי, בְּנוֹ נָתַן⁸⁷, אֲשֶׁר שָׁם עָלַי חֶתֶן 35
 יָקָרוּ בֵּעַת נָתַן גְּבִירָתוֹ בְּפִדְיוֹנוֹ,
 כְּבוֹדָהּ, יָקָרָהּ, בֵּת נְדִיבִים מְהֻלָּלָה,⁸⁸
 אֲשֶׁר הִיא מֵאַמְצַת לְבַעֲלָהּ עָלַי מוֹנִי,⁸⁹
 כְּמוֹ⁹⁰ בָּא לְשִׁמְחָה לְבָבָם, יִשְׁמַח
 לְבָבוֹ אֱלֹהִים, גַּם יְהוֹסִיף עָלַי שָׁנָיו; 40
 אֲדֹנִי לְנִכְחָה⁹¹ עָשׂוֹ⁹² שִׁיר נִכְחָה⁹³
 אֲשֶׁר דַּת שְׁבַחָהּ קָלְשָׁתוֹ⁹⁴ וַהֲגִינוֹ,

⁸⁴ = Neither the stormy sea nor the raining skies pour forth so abundantly as this generous man does his gifts.

⁸⁵ Cf. Josh. 6, 1.

⁸⁶ I fail to understand this clause.

⁸⁷ Cf. Num. 23, 18 בְּנוֹ צֶפֶר.

⁸⁸ MS. reads ...מְהוֹלָלָה.

⁸⁹ Isa. 49, 26.

⁹⁰ = כֹּאשֶׁר.

⁹¹ Cf. Exod. 14, 2.

⁹² = הוּא עוֹשֶׂה. The use of the infinitive in place of the participle is peculiar. Some grammarians cite ואִם אַחַהּ מֵאֵן Ex. 7, 27 as an example of this usage (Benseeb, תל"ע, Wilna 1879, 300). Upon this infinitive all the preceding clauses (l. 15-40) depend. The following two clauses (l. 42-44) modify the implied subject of this verb. The sequence of ideas in the poem, briefly put, is this: "To the prince Abu Isḥaḳ whose fame is world-wide etc. this poem is written by one who delights to praise him".

⁹³ Cf. Isa. 57, 2.

⁹⁴ I am unable to interpret this word.

אֲשֶׁר זָכַרְהָ עַל פִּי כְּנוּפֶת מֵאֵד נִמְתַּק
וְטוֹב מִפְּעֻלוֹתֶיהָ גְלוּיָי⁹⁵ וּמִצְפּוֹנָיו .

מֵאֵד יִתְמָהּוּ עַמִּים בְּשׁוֹרֵם עֲלוֹ[ת ש]יִרִי 45

עָרִי עַב | וְרָדְתִּי לְאַבְדּוֹן וּמִ[עֲוִיּוֹ];⁹⁶ 1 verso

וְהִנֵּנִי כְּשִׁיר עֹגֵב יִפָּה קוֹל וְטוֹב נֶגֶן⁹⁷

וְשִׁירִי בִיד⁹⁸ עוֹשֶׂק זִמְנִי וְעֶלְבוֹנִי

כְּגִבּוֹר⁹⁹ וְאִין חֶרֶב בִּידוֹ, כְּאֵלֹו לֹא

גְּבִירִי, בְּנֹו נִתָּן,¹⁰⁰ גְּדוּדָיו וְלִגְיוֹנָיו . 50

אֶקְוֶה וְאוֹחִיל לוֹ וְאִם יַעֲרֶה לִי צוּר

פְּעָמִים, וְרוּשׁ פֶּתֶן פְּעָמִים בְּשִׁלְחָנָיו ;

וּמִי הוּא אֲ[שֶׁר] זִמַּם דְּרוֹף עַל פְּנֵי אֶרֶץ

בְּרִנְלָיו וְלֹא תִדְרֹף אֲדָמָה עָלַי פָּנָיו .

וּכְתַב לְצָדִיק שְׁגַל עֲנָהוּ בִגְאֻרִיהָ 3

101 — — — — —

אֵלֵי עֶפֶר וּנְזַנְחָה

בְּכִי נִפְשִׁי אֲשֶׁר¹⁰² שָׁחָה¹⁰³

כְּאֵילָה [מִשְׁלַחָה]

אֲשֶׁר¹⁰⁴ רַבּוֹ כְּאֵיכָבָה

בְּעֵינֶיהָ וְהִדִּיחָה

אֲשֶׁר¹⁰⁵ הִטָּת¹⁰⁶ לְבָבָהּ

לִפְחַ יִקְוֶשׁ וְגַם שׁוֹחָה

מִשְׁכַּתָּהּ בְּחִבְלֵי שׁוּא

שִׁפְתֶיהָ בַּעַת שָׁחָה:¹⁰⁷

וְשִׁנִּית בְּרוֹב חֻלְקָתָה 5

⁹⁵ MS. reads גְלוּיָי .

⁹⁶ Cf. Sota 10b; Jellinek, בית המדרש, V, 44.

⁹⁷ Cf. Ezek. 33, 32 ⁹⁸ Cf. Job. 8, 4.

⁹⁹ MS. reads כְּגִבּוֹר .

¹⁰⁰ Cf. above l. 35.

¹⁰¹ The meter is another form of the Hazag. Cf. Brody, *ibid.*, 32b. The poem is modelled after Prov. 7.

¹⁰² Cf. אשר נתתי שפחתי לאישי Gen. 30, 18. ¹⁰³ Ps. 44, 26.

¹⁰⁴—¹⁰⁵ See note 102. ¹⁰⁶ Cf. Prov. 7, 21.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Ps. 105, 2. ¹⁰⁸ See note 102.

עֲלִיית קִיר מְרוֹנָחָה	"לָכֶּה דֹדִי עֲלֶה נָא אֶל
עֲדִי בְּקֶר וְנִשְׁמָחָה	"וְשֵׁם נִרְוָה אֲנִי דֹדִים
וְנִפְשִׁי לָךְ מִשְׁטָחָה	"וְשִׁלַּחֲנִי לָךְ עֲרוּגָה
לְאֶכְזָרִים וְהִיא נָחָה	אֲשֶׁר ¹⁰⁸ תִּתֵּן יִגְיַעָה ¹⁰⁹
לָךְ תִּפְּלֵ אֲשֶׁר סָחָה ¹¹⁰	וְאֵת תִּדְעַ וְתִבִּין כִּי
בְּחֶרֶב דִּין ¹¹² מִנְתָּחָה	וְאֵל תִּהְיֶה יִחִידָתָה ¹¹¹
וּמִקְטֹרֶתָה מִמֶּלֶחָה ¹¹⁴	בְּ[שִׁמּוֹן] מֹור ¹¹³ מְרוֹקָחָה
מִשׁוּבָה הִיא וְנִצָּחָה ¹¹⁶	פֶּרַע ¹¹⁵ אַחִי נִתְיַבְתָּה
וְהִיא שֶׁשָּׂה וְשִׁמָּחָה	וְאֵל נִכְרִי עֲצָבִיָּה ¹¹⁷
לְדַרְכּוֹ הַמִּשְׁבָּחָה	יֵרָא הָאֵל וְשׁוּב אֶחֱי
	15

4. וכתב לצדיק ועדה יגמע בינה ובין בעץ אכואנה

תְּהִלָּתוֹ ¹¹⁹ וְתַפְאֲרָתוֹ יִקְרוּ	חֲמָסִי עַל אֲהוּב לִבִּי [י] בְּחִירוֹ
שָׂאֵר פְּגָרִי עֲדִי הֵמֶת בְּשָׂרוֹ	אֲשֶׁר ¹²⁰ עָנָה מֵאֵד לִבִּי וְהִדַּק ¹²¹
כֹּאֵשׁ תִּבְעַר בִּיעַר אֹז שְׁמִירוֹ ¹²²	וְהִבְעִיר תְּאוֹתַי תּוֹף קֶרֶבִי
נִשְׂאִי עִמִּי וְגַם רֹאשׁוֹ גִּבִּירוֹ	בְּזִכְרוֹ לִי, יָדִיד נַפְשִׁי וְרוּחִי, ¹²³

¹⁰⁹ Job. 39, 11. ¹¹⁰ Cf. Ezek. 26, 4.

¹¹¹ Ps. 22, 21.

¹¹² Quarrel. Cf. Targum Prov. 17, 1.

¹¹³ Cf. Esther 2, 12.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Ex. 30, 1, 35. The meaning of lines 11 and 12 is: Do not allow your soul to be torn by disputes while she is perfumed with oil of myrrh and has her incense seasoned with salt. MS. reads מור מרוקחים מנותחה ב... מור מרוקחים ומקטרתו.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Prov. 4, 15. ¹¹⁶ Cf. Jerem. 8, 5.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Prov. 5, 10.

¹¹⁸ This and the following poems are written in the same meter as the first poem.

¹¹⁹ MS. reads תהילתו. ¹²⁰ Cf. above note 102.

¹²¹ Cf. II Chron. 34, 4. ¹²² Cf. Isa. 10, 17.

¹²³ This phrase modifies the subject of בזכרו, whereas the following phrase נשיא עמי is the object of the same verb.

5 נָדִיב לִבָּב וְשׁוֹעַ¹²⁴ בָּהּ בַּחִיר אֶל
וְהוּא יוֹסֵף בֶּנּוּ יַעֲקֹב¹²⁶ אֲשֶׁר הוּא
[וְ]כֵן הִנֵּנִי, כִּמּוֹ יַעֲקֹב, בְּאַבְלִי
וְהִנֵּה כְּאֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְבִדּוֹ
אֲנִי אֲבִיכָה עָלַי יוֹסֵף בַּחִירִי
10 וְאִשִּׁים אֶל לְמוֹכִיחַ וְדִין
וְרַמְנִי בְּאִמְרוֹ לִי כִּי[רִי] עַ
עַדִּי הִרִיד¹³⁰ וְשָׁלַט אֶת לִבִּי
עַטָּא אַחִי אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה כֶּמֶר[י]¹³¹
נִשְׁתַּתְּנִי וְתַדַּע כִּי לִבִּי
15 וּמִדּוֹ[ע]... אָבִי בְּכָל־עֵת

... שבע

5.

2 Recto ועם כלת נעורִיךְ ואשת בריִיךְ. נועות

... ה. מהוללה נקייה ומבטן גרועה מנ. עות
אשר לא. ת חפץ וחסד בזה תיגע וכל נש. יגיעות
תבורך. ה ובעלה ויולדתה בכל עתות ושעות

6. וכתב ימרח ר' יהודה בן יוסף

לְמִי אֶקְשׁוֹר בְּמוֹ שִׁירֵי עֲטָרָה
וְאֵף עַל מִי רָדִיד הַחֹן אֲשֶׁה
וְאֵל מִי אֶאֱרוֹג בְּנִיב צִפְרָה
וְאֶעֱדָה פֹּז וְכָל־אֲבֵן יִקְרָה
וּמִהֲלִי לְנִפְשׁוֹ הַבְּרוּרָה;
הָלֹא לְשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר יִמְעַט שְׁבַחִי

¹²⁴ Cf. above No. 2, l. 17. ¹²⁵ Cf. Prov. 14, 15.

¹²⁶ MS. reads . . . יוסף ול. If this textual emendation be right, the man referred to as נשיא עמו was a certain Joseph ben Jacob.

¹²⁷ Cf. above No. 2, l. 35. ¹²⁸ Cf. Gen. 49, 26.

¹²⁹ = I am like Jacob in mourning one who is like unto Joseph in beauty. MS. reads באבלי.

¹³⁰ Cf. Isa. 45, 1. ¹³¹ Cf. Dan. 2, 47.

- לְמַעַל מַעַל מִן הַשָּׁרָה;
 וְעַל יָדָיו מִבְּכַה הַסְּחֹרָה
 תִּפְזְרָנָה לְכָל־שׂוֹאֵל מִהֶרָה;
 מִסְבָּלוֹת עָלֵי גֵב הַנְּדִירָה
 כָּאֵלּוּ לֹא יִרְשֶׁה הַבְּכֹרָה
 כְּדֵי לְרֹאוֹת דְּמוּתוֹ הַהֲדוּרָה
 וְלֹא אִם (אֵת) ¹³⁶ מִתְּנֵת יָדוֹ עֲקָרָה;
 וּבִינָתוֹ בְּמַעַשׂ (הֵם) ¹³⁶ וְאִמְרָה
 יִקְוִיתֵאל ¹⁴¹ וְיֵד אֲבָרָם וְשָׁרָה; ¹⁴²
 מֵאֵד אֶרֶץ וְאִם קִסְמוֹ קִסְרָה; ¹⁴³
 פָּנֵי צָרִים כְּקִסְמוֹ הַשְּׁחֹרָה;
 דְּבַר חֲכָמָה לְכָל־לְבוֹת שְׁמוּרָה;
 וּמִלֵּאכֵי וְאִם ¹⁴⁷ יִכְתֹּב בְּעֹזְרָה;
- אֲשֶׁר לְשׁוֹר ¹³² בָּרָאוּ אֵל וּנִפְשׁוּ
 5 אֲשֶׁר סָחְרוּ נְתִינָה לֹא לְקִיחָה
 לְמַעַן פִּי אֲשֶׁר תִּכְנַס וְתִקְבִּץ
 וְאִם יֵדֵר תִּבּוֹאִינָה מִנּוֹתָיו
 וְאֵל ¹³³ חֶסֶד וּמַעַשׂ טוֹב יִכְבֵּד
 וְכָל יָבֵא פִתְחָיו הַפְּתוּחִים
 10 מִצֵּאוֹ לֹא ¹³⁴ אֲבִי חֶסֶדוֹ ¹³⁵ עֲרִירִי
 אֲשֶׁר לְבֹו וְעֲנֻתוֹ וְיָדוֹ ¹³⁷
 כָּלֵב דְּוִיד ¹³⁸ וּבֵין ¹³⁹ נִינֹו ¹⁴⁰ וְעֲנֻת
 אֲשֶׁר עִטּוֹ אֵלֵי מִזְרַח וּמַעֲרֵב
 אֲשֶׁר יִלְבִּין פָּנָי רַבִּים ¹⁴⁴ וְיִשִּׁים
 15 [אֲשֶׁר] רֵאצְלוֹ ¹⁴⁵ בְּנִילִיּוֹן חֲרוּתִים ¹⁴⁶
 [אֲשֶׁר יֵן] אוֹם בְּפִיו חֲנֵי זְכָרִיה

¹³² Cf. Isa. 32, 1. ¹³³ = על. Cf. I Sam. 4, 21. אל הלקח ארון אלהים.

¹³⁴ MS. reads ערירו לו... .

¹³⁵ = Benefactor. Cf. above No. 4, l. 5. Similarly ¹³⁶ = generosity. The meaning then is that whoever came to see him found him generous.

¹³⁶ Copyist's errors.

¹³⁷ = חסדו. See Ibn Janah, ספר השרשים, s. v. יד, and Nehem. 2, 8. The poet enumerates four qualities of Judah b. Joseph, viz. a perfect heart, modesty, kindness, and wisdom, and then mentions the Biblical personages who were known for one or the other of these qualities. We are therefore justified in reading כלב דוד instead of בנין דוד.

¹³⁸ Cf. I Kings II, 4 and 15, 3. ¹³⁹ = ובינת.

¹⁴⁰ = בנו, i. e. Solomon. See Ibn Janah, *ibid.*, s. v. ניין.

¹⁴¹ = Moses. See Tal. Bab. Megillah 13a.

¹⁴² Cf. Ber. Rab. 78 זה אברהם... כרחמן שנאבות... .

¹⁴³ So in MS. = קצרה. ¹⁴⁴ Cf. Gen. 21, 20.

¹⁴⁵ MS. reads לו...ראה. ¹⁴⁶ MS. reads חרותות.

¹⁴⁷ Read perhaps וגם or ואף.

[אֲשֶׁר יֵה] נָה בְּשִׁיר דָּוִד, וְקוּלוֹ
 יִם [כָּל] בְּעֵלִי מִקְרָא¹⁴⁸ בְּמִקְרָא
 [מִ] שִׁיחַ אֶל בַּחִיר גָּדוֹל וְנוֹרָא
 הִרְנַתְנוּ לְרוֹב גִּיל [ה] [וְ] אֹרָה
 צֶחֶק כְּדוֹד
 רוֹנֵן בּוֹ נְבִיאִים

7. לְדוֹד בֶּן בְּנֵשׁ רִיסַת כְּמִרָא

... וחטא ... נפשי ... אשר או ... עניה וספ ... להתר ...
 שר בן רפ ... ה ...
 2 verso וְהָ יוֹעִיל רְפוּאוֹת הַפְּגָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּהְיֶה יְחִידָתָם ...
 וְעֲלֶיהָ לְשִׁמַּח בְּיוֹם זֶה יְחִידָתִי בְּמוֹ שְׂמִיחָה שְׁלֵמָה
 5 ב... מְשׁוּבָחָה נְכוּחָה מְקוּיָמָה מְרוּמָמָה נְעִימָה
 בְּרֵאשִׁית לְבָבוֹת מְרַקֶּדֶת לְכָל־נֶפֶשׁ עֲנוּמָה
 מְזַקֶּקָה כְּמוֹ כֶּסֶף [וְ] זָהָב בְּדָם פָּרִים בְּהָרֵי עַד קְדוּמָה
 וְנוֹשָׁנָה, בְּתוֹלָה לֹא יָד [וְ] עָה [לֹאִישׁ] מִיּוֹם שְׁטַחוֹת חֲתוּמָה
 וְאֵז אֲשִׁמַּח וְאֲנִיל עִם חֲבִירִי בָּהּ בְּהִירָאָה חֲתֻמָּה
 10 תְּהִי בְּרוּךְ תְּהִי נִיטָר וְיִהְיֶה שְׁנוּתֶיהָ יְמֵי עֵיֶשׁ וְכִימָה

8. וְכָתַב יַעֲתֵב עָלַי תֹּאכִיר וְעַד

לְטוֹב שְׁמָה אֲעוֹפֶה בְּנִשְׁרִים וְאֶל שְׁמַעְיָה אֲדַלֵּג כְּעַפְרִים
 וְלִרְאוּתָהּ¹⁴⁹ בְּמוֹ עֵב קַל אֲמַהֵר כָּאלֹו בִּם לֹאֵל עָלַי נְדָרִים
 וּמְרוֹב תִּאֲוֹתִי לְחֻזּוֹת אֶת־ יִפֶּה טוֹב מַעֲשֵׂיהָ חֲנֻכָּרִים
 אֲנִי רָצִיתִי כְּאִישׁ יְרוּיָן לְבִשָּׁר וְגַם לְקְרֹא פִקְחֻקוֹת אֲסוּרִים
 5 וְכָל־רֶכֶס וְכָל־עֶקֶב וְכָל־הֶר עֲבַרְתִּימוֹ כְּמַסְלֹולִים יִשְׁרִים

¹⁴⁸ = Karaites. In corroboration of my rendering בעלי מקרא as Karaites Dr. Alexander Marx called my attention to the postscript of Benjamin Nahawendi's משאת בנימין where this term occurs as follows: זה כבר כתבתי לכם
 ספר דינים שתדינו כם בעלי מקרא.

¹⁴⁹ MS. reads ולדמותך.

וְהַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לִפְנֵי	בְּרַב־חֶמֶד עֲבָרְתִּים בְּנֶהְרִים
וְעַתָּה בָּאתִי וּדְמִיתִי הַיּוֹתִי	לְעַמִּית סָגְרוּ עָלַי [י] שְׁעָרִים
וְתוֹחַלְתִּי בַיָּמִים נִכְזָבָה לִי	וְתִקְוֹתִי לְמַפְחֵי שְׂבָרִים
הֲלֹא אַתָּה אֲשֶׁר תִּקְשֶׁר בְּדַעְתָּךְ	וּמוֹסְרָךְ לְאַנְשֵׁי לֵב בְּתָרִים
וְכָל־חֶכֶם וְיֹדֵעַ וְיֹדֵעַ וְיֹדֵעַ	מְגַלֶּה סוֹד וּמַחְבּוֹאֵי סִתְרִים
סִבִּיבֶיךָ בְּכֹכָבִים וְאַתָּה	כִּמּוֹ חֶמֶה גְבִירַת הַמְּאוֹרִים
בְּמַלְיָה וְטוֹב לְקַחְךָ תַּחֲיָה	וְתִקְוִין אֶת יִשְׁיֵי הַקְּבָרִים
וְתִמְשֹׁךְ הַלְּבָבוֹת אַחֲרֶיךָ	בְּאֵלּוֹ הֵם בִּידֶיךָ עֲצוּרִים
לְמַעַן כִּי אֲחִי מוֹסֵר בְּכָל־עִיר	וְאִם רָמוּ וְאִם רָשָׁו חֲבָרִי [ס]
וּמִדּוֹעַ אֲחִי עָמָם בְּמִסְפָּר	וְאַחֲשֹׁב בְּעֵינֶיךָ בְּזוֹ [רִים]
וְרַבִּים יוֹפְרוּךְ בְּגִדֵּיבוֹת	וְרוֹחֵב לֵב וּמַפְעֵלִים [יָקָרִים]
וְכִי כ[פָּדָה] לְכָל־שְׂוֹאֵל פֶּתוּ [חָה]	...לֹא אֶרְאֶה לְ.....
מִטָּ... לְכָל־אָדָם יִרְוּ	וְטַלְיָה בְּנֵי אִישׁ מ...
וְעֵבִי... בִּינָה בְּרַבִּי נָת...	כ. הֵיז [וְרִים]
... שְׂוֹאֵל בְּאֵין טַל	יְהִי עֲלֶיךָ.....
..... יִרְקוֹן	וְאַנְכִי כ. ם
.... ת..... בְּצִמָּא	וּמִשְׁתַּוָּקָק.....

NOTE

In the poetic fragment published in the preceding number of this *QUARTERLY*, p. 109-III, I failed to notice that the piece designated as רהט contains the acrostic *יחִי, וְיִשְׁקֵט, יוֹסֵף חֲזוֹן יִזְכֶּה שְׁשׁוּ* which is undoubtedly the name of the author, followed by some euphemistic phrase in abbreviation. What this abbreviation stands for I am unable to say. Perhaps some reader will be able to suggest a solution.

THE JEWS OF ARABIA AND THE GAONATE

It is generally assumed that the Jews of Arabia were totally expelled from that country in the beginning of Islam: the Banū Ẹainuḳā' and the Banū Nāḁir, numbering together about 1300, by Muhammed (Grätz, V³, 99. 100) and the bulk of Arabian Jews in Khaibar and the neighboring settlements by 'Omar (ruled 634-644). "So great, says Grätz (V³, 108; English translation III, 84), was the fanaticism of the second caliph 'Omar, a man of a wild and energetic nature, that he broke the treaty made by Muhammed with the Jews of Khaibar and Wāḁi'l-Ḳura. He drove them from their lands, as he did also the Christians of Najrān, in order that the holy ground of Arabia might not be desecrated by Jews and Christians. 'Omar assigned the landed property of the Jews to the Muhammedan warriors and a strip of land near the town of Kufa on the Euphrates was—with a certain measure of justice—given them in return (about 640)."¹ This is also the opinion of Hirschfeld who has given much attention to the history of the Jews in Arabia. He says (*JE.*, II, 43*b*, article "Arabia"): " 'Omar, however, drove them out of the country and they left for Syria" (cf. also *JE.*, VII, 481*a*). This verdict has often been repeated and has even passed for "a matter of history" (cf. Marcus N. Adler, *The Itinerary*

¹ Also the fourth edition of the fifth volume of Grätz' *History* which has just appeared and has been carefully revised by Eppenstein leaves the above statement untouched.

of *Benjamin of Tudela*, 46, note 4). Despite this consensus of opinion, the supposition that the Jews were wholly driven out from Arabia is unfounded. The expulsion of the Jews by 'Omar is ascribed by the Muhammedan historians (so by Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüstenfeld, 779, and others) to the fact that 'Omar who at first had left the Jews unmolested received the information that Muhammed had declared on his deathbed: "No two religions shall exist together on the Arabian peninsula". This utterance of Muhammed was accepted as genuine by many Muhammedan theologians (see Goldziher, *REJ.*, XXIX, 75, note 3; comp. Gottheil, "Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt", in: *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, II, 353, note 2). It was, however, pointed out by Caetani in his monumental work *Annali dell' Islam*, II 1, 507, that this tradition rather reflects the intolerant spirit of the second or third Muhammedan century and is refuted by the fact that the famous church of Ṣan'ā in Yemen was still tolerated in the time of the second 'Abbasid caliph Maṣṣūr (754-775) and that Wādī 'l-Ḳura is still spoken of as a Jewish settlement under 'Abdalmalik (685-705; comp. Caetani, *ibid.*, II, 50, note 7). But whatever the genuineness of the tradition, we have the unequivocal testimony of the early Arabic historian Wāḳidī (died 823 C. E.) that not all Jews were expelled from Arabia. He declares expressly (Wellhausen, *Muhammed in Medina*, Berlin 1882, 292; for other quotations see Caetani, *l. c.*, II, 50): "'Omar expelled the Jews from Khaibar and Fadak, but allowed them to remain in Wādī 'l-Ḳura and Taimā, because Wādī 'l-Ḳura still belonged to *Sha'm* (Syria), while (the Arabian province) Hijāz began to the south of it." Khaibar was four days' journey from Medina. Wādī 'l-Ḳura lay nearby

to the east of Khaibar. Fadak and Taimā lay more north (see the splendid map of Jewish settlements in Caetani's work, II 1, opposite p. 376). The fact that Fadak, which lay more north than Wādi 'l-Kura and must officially have belonged to Syria, was one of the places from which the Jews were expelled shows that 'Omar's action was not prompted by the apocryphal utterance of the dying Prophet.

However this may be, it is a most fortunate coincidence that the two places—Wādi'l-Kura and Taimā—in which the Jews, according to Wākidī, were allowed to remain, should figure as Jewish settlements in later Jewish sources. In an old index of Gaonic responsa published by Ginzberg (*Geonica*, II; 54 ff.) occurs the following entry: אֲלֹרֶנֶּה אֶלְסַאדֶּס שְׁאֵלוֹת בְּנֵי וָאֲדִי אֶלְקָרִי לְרַבְנֵי שְׂרִירָא גֵאֹנִין וְהָאִי אֲבִי ז'ל. Unfortunately of this "sixth bundle" only the reference to the first responsum is preserved, but it no doubt contained numerous such "questions". A similar entry is found in the Gaonic responsa published by Harkavy, p. 94: אֵלֹ הַשְּׁאֵלוֹת שֶׁשְּׁאֵלוּ בְּנֵי וָאֲדִי אֶלְקָרִי מִלִּפְנֵי אֲדוֹנִי שְׂרִירָא רֹאשׁ הַיְּשִׁיבָה ז'ל. The two entries most probably refer to the same collection, for the first responsum, of which only the question is preserved, is identical in Harkavy's and Ginzberg's text. It is characteristic that this responsum deals with agriculture, and it is perhaps not accidental that the Talmudic passage (Baba Bathra 82a) on which the question hinges discusses the applicability of the Mishnaic law to palm-trees. For the Jews of these Arabian settlements were, as we know, engaged in agriculture and especially in the cultivation of palms. Harkavy's text has also preserved the answers of two more responsa dealing with the law of inheritance.

Taimā as a Jewish settlement is mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (ed. M. N. Adler, London 1907, Hebrew

text, p. 46 f.). It is described by Benjamin as the capital of a large country in which the Jews lead an independent life. The land is governed by two brothers—Salmōn and Hānān—princes of Davidic descent—“*who dispatch many questions to the exilarch—their kinsman—in Bagdad.*” Whatever exaggerations there may attach to Benjamin’s account of the Arabian Jews which is obviously founded on hearsay (cf. Adler, *ibid.* p. 48, n. 2), the main and most important fact—the existence of Jews on the Arabian peninsula many centuries after their supposed total expulsion from that country—cannot be doubted. It is characteristic of the central position of the Gaonate in Jewish life that even in its last representatives it was able to exert its influence over the distant half-mythical Jews in free Arabia and shape their professional and civil life. It shows at the same time that the Arabian Jews, however far removed from the center of Jewish learning, recognized the authority of the Talmud and were not in any way guilty of those anti-Talmudic sentiments which Grätz is prone to ascribe to their forefathers.²

THE JEWS OF ARABIA AND THE RECHABITES

In connection with the foregoing remarks a word may be said about the designation of Arabian Jews as Rechabites, the descendants of Jonadab ben Rechab (Jerem. 35). Benjamin of Tudela, in his account of the Jews of Taimā, quoted in the preceding notice, describes them, according to the text of the current editions, as היהודים [הנקראים] בני רכב אנשי תימא (see ed. Grünhut, p. 64, l. 4. and variants.

² See above, p. 209 ff.

comp. also p. 125 f.). R. Obadiah of Bertinoro who speaks in his first letter from Jerusalem (in 1488) of Jewish tribes in Arabia adds, without any reference to R. Benjamin and obviously quite independently of him: "It is said that they are the descendants of the Rechabites" (Neubauer, "*Where are the Ten Tribes?*" in *JQR.*, I, 196). In modern times S. L. Rappoport made this identification the basis of ingenious conjectures in a lengthy article in the *Bikkure ha-'Ittim*, 1824, 50 ff. Neubauer (*ibid.*, 24), who knew the above quoted passage of Benjamin in its different readings (see later), refers to this identification as a well-known fact. "The Jews of Haibar (=Khaibar) even pretended to be the descendants of the Rechabites." The learned Rabinowitz in his Hebrew translation of Grätz, III, 117, in speaking of the Jews of Khaibar, adds **אשר יאמר להם היהודים** without the authority of the original (Grätz, V, 105). For other applications of the same name compare Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela* p. 47 and 49. Adler (*ibid.*, 49) is of the opinion that "the whole misconception" has arisen from the faulty text of one MS. and of all the printed editions which in the above quoted passage read **רכב** instead of the correct **כיבר** offered by other MSS. According to Adler, the passage is to be read **היהודים הנקראים כיבר אנשי תימא** (Hebrew text, p. 46; comp. the variants note 20 and Neubauer *ibid.*, 191, n. 2). But apart from the linguistic difficulty—one expects at least **בני כיבר**—, Khaibar is described by Benjamin separately in a later passage (ed. Adler, p. 48): it is placed at a considerable distance from Taimā and sharply distinguished from it. Moreover, the use of the same designation by R. Obadiah (and other Hebrew writers,

see later) shows that the identification of the Arabian Jews with the Rechabites is more than a mere "misconception." In the following I should like to offer a different explanation which at first sight may seem complex but will appear natural to those who are acquainted with the fanciful notions entertained with regard to the distant Jewish communities during the Middle Ages.

It is known that the Jews of Arabia, like every other Jewish community with a semblance of independence, were associated with the Lost Ten Tribes (Neubauer in the above quoted article, p. 24 *et passim*). Benjamin of Tudela tells us distinctly (ed. Adler, p. 48) that the Jews of Khairbar were held to belong to the two and a half tribes that were led captive by Shalmaneser. Now it is a fact, recognized by Epstein in his dissertation on Eldad ha-Dani but not sufficiently taken into account by other writers, that the wild speculations about the Ten Tribes were largely influenced by the no less wild speculations about Alexander the Great, as preserved in the innumerable versions of the Greek Alexander romance, of the so-called Greek Pseudo-Callisthenes (ed. Carl Müller, Paris 1846).³ The mythical Sambation finds its parallel, if not its prototype, in the "sand river" of Pseudo-Callisthenes (Book II, chapter 30; comp. also Epstein *Eldad ha-Dani*, 13 f.). The Gymnosophists or the "naked philosophers" whom Alexander visits and admires for their ideal conduct of life and their wise answers (Pseudo-Callisthenes II 35; III 5 ff.) are identified in a Muhammedan legend⁴, which no doubt reflects a

³ I have dealt with Pseudo-Callisthenes and its relation to the Talmudic and other oriental versions in my article "Alexanders Zug nach dem Lebensquell und die Chadhirlegende" in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, volume XIII.

⁴ Quoted by Kazwini (died 1283) in his *Cosmography*, ed. Wüstenfeld, II, 18; comp. Fraenkel, *ZDMG.*, XLV, 327 f.

Jewish original (comp. Epstein, *ibid.*, 15 ff.),⁵ with the Bene Moshe (Banū Mūsa) who are placed behind the mythical "sand river" (*wādi ar-raml*) and are credited with all possible virtues. Abraham Yagel (sixteenth century) shows the same influence of the Alexander romance when he designates as the boundaries of the Ten Tribes, besides the Sambation and the Sand-sea (which he thus separates), also "the mountains of the Sun and the Moon which Alexander the Great tried to pass" (Neubauer, *l. c.*, 412). Now the climax in Alexander's travels and adventures is his march to the Islands of the Blessed which, ultimately, prove inaccessible to him (Pseudo-Callisthenes II, 40). We cannot enter here into the fanciful speculations about the inhabitants of these islands which occupy a prominent place in the history of the Alexander legend. We will merely mention the fact that Josippon, ch. x, describes these mythical islands which are surrounded by the mountains of Darkness and cannot be reached even by the irresistible conqueror as מָקוֹם יוֹנֵדֵב בֶּן רַכָּב וְקֶצֶת הַשְּׁבִטִים הַדְרִים יָחַד אַחֵר קדושי אלהים וזרע אברהם עבדו; they are called ארץ עובדי אלהים and their inhabitants are declared to be קדושי אלהים וזרע אברהם עבדו. In other words, the Rechabites and the other tribes with them are believed to be the citizens of that inaccessible Utopia which fancy accepted as the dwelling-place of the Bene Moshe and the other lost tribes. That the connection of the Rechabites with the Blessed Islands of the Alexander romance is not a mere whim on the part of

⁵ Kāzwinī quotes the legend in the name of the famous Jewish convert Ka'b al-Aḥbār (died 32 Hijra). But Epstein is wrong in laying stress on this circumstance. For the reference to Ka'b's authority is very often a mere literary fiction. It is, however, possible that this legend of the Bene Moshe was known to Muhammed (cf. Geiger, *Was hat Muhammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen*, p. 168).

Josippon is shown by the fact that the same conception is to be found in the Slavonian Alexander legend (see Wesselovsky, *Iz istoriji romana i powiesti*, I, 280 ff.). The close relation of the Rechabites, who by their ascetic way of life and staunch adherence to their ancestral customs were very well qualified for this rôle, to the Bene Moshe and the other Lost Tribes is also assumed by Abraham Yagel (Neubauer, *l. c.*, 413) who refers among other things to a passage, obviously spurious, in Maimonides' letters in which the Rechabites are mentioned in connection with the Sambation and the Ten Tribes.

I may mention in conclusion that the Messianic impostor Abū 'Īsa of Ispahan (see about him this volume, p. 203), who considered himself a precursor of the Messiah and thus was expected to gather the Ten Tribes, is supposed, according to Shahrastānī (ed. Cureton, I, 168) "to have gone to the Banū Mūsa who are behind the "sand" to preach to them the word of God". The "sand" (*raml*) is the mythical "sand river" (*Wādi ar-raml*) mentioned by Ẓazwīnī in connection with the Banū Mūsa and is nothing else but the Sambation. Grätz (V³, 406) translates *raml* by "*Wüste*" and identifies it with "*die grosse Salzwüste, welche sich nördlich von Isfahan erstreckt*" (!). The statement of Shahrastānī which the latter probably derived from some Jewish authority is nothing but the reflexion of the Messianic speculations of that period and it is remarkable that Grätz should have taken it so seriously (*ibid.*,

⁶ *warā' ar-raml*. MS. British Museum Add. 7251 reads *warā' an-nahr ar-raml*. This is grammatically impossible. It is either *warā' nahr ar-raml* "behind the river of sand", or *an-nahr* is merely a variant of *ar-raml*. "Behind the river" could refer to the Sambation but might also, in Arabic parlance, indicate Transoxania. The latter would explain Maimonides' statement in his *Iggeret Tēmān*. See this volume p. 206, n. 89.

and p. 160). Curiously enough Hadassi (*Eshkol ha-Kofer*, 41c) derives Abū 'Īsa's interdiction of wine and meat ממאמר הנאמר על בני יונדב בן רכב. But this reference to the Rechabites which is not found in Ẹırķisānī may as well be the individual conjecture of Hadassi.

BONFIRES ON PURIM

The custom of burning Haman in effigy was recently discussed at some length by Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 1 f., and Davidson, *Parody in Jewish Literature*, 21, note 33. To the data collected by these scholars I should like to add two references from Arabic sources which prove the existence of this custom among the Jews of Asia and Africa in different periods. Al-Bīrūnī of Khwāris̄m (died 1048 C. E.) in his *Chronology of Ancient Nations* (text ed. Sachau, p. 280; Sachau's translation, p. 274), in speaking of the fourteenth of Adar, says: "There is great joy over the death of Hāmān on that day. This feast is also called the *Feast of McGillā*, and further *Hāmān-Sūr*." For on that day they make figures which they beat and then burn, imitating the burning of Hāmān. The same they practise on the fifteenth." The famous Egyptian writer Maḳrīzī (died 1442 C. E.) who, in his work on Cairo, devotes a whole chapter to "the Calendar and the Festivals of the Jews" makes the following remark in his discussion of the Purim feast (*Khīṭaṭ*, new edition, Cairo 1326 H., IV, 364, line 6 from bottom): **وَرُبَّمَا صَوَّرَ بَعْضُهُمْ فِي هَذَا الْيَوْمِ صُورَةَ**

⁷ Schreiner, *REJ.*, XII, 266, note 2, rightly emends **ها من سور** into **ها من سوز** *Hāmān-Sūz*, which designates in Persian "Hāmān-burning."

هَيَّانُ الْوَزِيرِ وَهُمْ يَسْمُونَهُ هَامَانَ فَإِذَا صَوَّرُوهُ أَلْقَوْهُ بَعْدَ الْعَبَثِ بِهِ حَتَّى

يَحْتَرَقُ "many a time some of them would make at this day a figure of Haimān the Vizier—they call him Hāmān—, and when they had made a figure of him, they would play about with it and then throw it into the fire until it is burned." The discrimination between the pronunciation Hāmān and Haimān is probably due to the fact that in the Koran, owing to a misunderstanding on the part of Muhammed, Hāmān figures as an adviser of *Pharao* (comp. Geiger, *Was hat Muhammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen* p. 156). The Muhammedans, it seems, were for this reason obliged to modify the name of the Vizier of Ahasuerus, in order to distinguish him from his namesake in the Koran. The wording of Maḳrīzī's remark apparently implies that this custom was in his time no longer in general practice among the Jews of Egypt.

The above chapter of Maḳrīzī was published and translated by De Sacy in his *Chrestomathy*. In his explanatory notes (vol. I, p. 319) the celebrated Orientalist refers to Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*, book VIII, chapter 6, in which the latter speaks of this custom as practised by the Jews in the fourth century. The Jews were accustomed to erect a gibbet and hang on it a figure of Haman. In fact, they are supposed to have gone so far as to change the gibbet into a cross and to burn it together with the figure. Theodosius II. prohibited this anti-Christian demonstration putting on it a heavy punishment. Many persecutions are said to have resulted from this Jewish practice. On the anti-Christian character of this custom compare also the additional note in Ginzberg's, *Geonica*, p. 419.

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America

ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER

THE GROUPING OF THE CODICES IN THE GREEK JOSHUA

A PRELIMINARY NOTICE

WHILE engaged in a study of the transliterations occurring in the Greek Old Testament (the material consisting of 1200 words is all collected and almost ready for publication), I deemed it advisable to include geographical terms (like "Ashe-doth", "Gai", "Emek", "Negeb", etc.) and names of places for which a perspicuous etymology is available (comp. "Bethaven", "Bethel", Beth-hammarcaboth", etc.), especially as in some of these cases translation alternates with transliteration. This additional material being particularly abundant in the Book of Joshua, my attention was caught by the frequently recurring collocation of certain sigla in the apparatus of Holmes-Parsons. In one instance where an entire verse had to be investigated, the grouping was unmistakable. With the key found, I set about working up chapters 15 and 19 which are replete with place-names, but also other passages, covering in all one half of the book. My key proved to work; of course, as my range of observation widened, slight rearrangements in detail ensued which, however, left the general grouping intact. I am aware that Hollenberg was once engaged in a similar occupation (for Joshua and Judges); his one short article in the *ZAW.*, I (1881), 97-105, deals with the matter only casually. In addition to Holmes-Parsons, my apparatus includes Swete's manual edition, Field's Hexapla, Lagarde's Lucian and Syrohexaplaris, Ciasca's edition of the Sahidic fragments, Dillmann's edition of the Ethiopic version, Eusebius' Onomasticon in the editions of Lagarde and Klostermann, and, thanks to the liberality of the Dropsie College, the Leiden publication of the Codex Sarravianus-Colbertinus (G) and Tischendorf's

Monumenta Sacra. My results, while at present naturally only tentative (especially with regard to the sub-groups), go to reveal the following six groups:

(1) The Complutensian Group (**c**) = 108. Compl. 19 requires a renewed examination; to judge from silence, it often deviates from **c** in favor of **b**. The Complutensian occasionally exhibits readings of its own. In the middle part of the book there is a remarkable agreement between Lucian (= 19.108. Compl.) and Hexapla (G for instance), even if the points of difference which are constant (comp. the Greek for "south") are had in mind. (According to Hautsch, *Der Lukiantext des Okatateuch*, 1910, the Lucianic (Antiochene) recension is related to group **h**, specifically to 54.75. Thus 19.108. Compl. represent a recension whose affinity is decidedly with the Hexaplar text. In some cases, indeed, readings of the Syrohex. are found exclusively in 19.108. Compl.) Accordingly I include under **c** as a sub-group FG. 58 Syrohex. Euseb.

(2) The Aldine Group (**a**) = 15. 64; 18. 128; Ald. The latter is an eclectic text and occasionally deviates in favor of 121 or some other source.

(3). The Oxford (Grabian) Group (**o**) = A. 29. 121 (.82); N. 56. 71 (.59). Of these, some (esp. 82) often go with **b**. According to Parsons, 72 agrees with 29. M probably belongs here; but a more detailed examination is requisite.

(4) The Hesychian (?) (see Swete, Introduction, 482) Group (**h**) = 44. 106; 54. 75. 118; 74. 76. 84. 106. 134. 44 and 106 go together principally in orthography; practically only two sub-groups result: 54. 75. 118 over against the remainder.

(5) The Catenae Group (**n**) = 16. 30. 52. 53. 57. 77. 85. 131. 144. 209. 236. 237. Cat-Nic. Of these, 53. 85. 144 constitute a sub-group; 30 and 209 also occasionally separate from the rest, but do not always go together.

(6) The Sixtine Group (**b**) = B. 55. 63. 120. Sahidic. Ethiopic. Cyr-Alex.; readings also in Euseb. The relation of 55. 63 to the correctors of B and the Ethiopian (*fh*) remains to be investigated; codices *cg* of the latter version exhibit read-

ings taken from the Hebrew (probably through the medium of a non-Greek translation).

When we come to arrange these six groups (Lagarde's "manipuli") into larger divisions (Lagarde's "legiones"), the test of Hexaplaric additions or omissions proves of less value than the criterion of transliteration. For it is all the difference in the world whether the Hexaplaric (the term should be taken *cum grano salis*) *diaskeue* was applied to a text of the one division or of the other. Thus, from the point of view of transliteration and its close approach in consonants and vowels to the received Hebrew text, there practically result two main divisions which group themselves respectively about the Vatican (B) and Alexandrine (A): the one consisting of the groups **bnh**, the other of **oac**. I designate the latter division as the Palestino-Syrian (**P**), and the former as the Egyptian (**E**). *The Alexandrine codex reveals itself as the Palestino-Syrian text minus the Hexaplaric additions.* In the division **E**, the Vatican codex represents the purest text, so far as Hexaplaric additions are concerned, but is exceedingly corrupt in its proper names. In other words, Hexaplaric *corrections* (of a tacit character; from Theodotion? the same source used by Lucian?) which are embodied in the Alexandrine and its satellites have on the whole been kept out of the groups related to the Vatican (**bnh**), though some of them indulge in Hexaplaric *additions*. Moreover, the Hexaplaric additions found in the Egyptian codices sometimes differ from those in **P** (from Aquila and Symmachus?). Hexaplaric additions, on the other hand, are confined in the groups **oa** to individual codices or sub-groups.

A critical edition of the Greek text of the Book of Joshua thus becomes a matter of realization within sight. For with a knowledge of the grouping as above outlined, the process of collation is reduced to utmost simplicity. In each case, one representative (for each group or sub-group) will serve our purposes. New material not made use of in Holmes-Parsons may be found to fall in with the groups recognized or, as the case may be, serve to reveal new groups, though hardly a new main division. The text should be printed in two columns

corresponding to the two forms which it assumed in Palestine and Syria on the one hand and in Egypt on the other. For the Palestino-Syrian text the Alexandrine should form the basis; it should be freely emended from the groups belonging to the **P** division. For the Egyptian division which alone leads the way to the original Septuagint the Vatican should be made the foundation; but it again must undergo judicious correction on the basis of its satellites. Errors which at first sight appear hopeless lend themselves to correction when the cognate groups are consulted. And it must be borne in mind that, whereas **A** stands related to its peculiar groups only, **B** dominates the entire range of codices. For **P** is but **E** corrected and adjusted to the Masoretic Text. Moreover, with the eclecticism of some of our codices, Egyptian readings appear sporadically in **P** texts.

Below each column there should be a double set of notes: one embodying Hexaplaric matter, and the other the critical grounds for the reading adopted in the text.

When this work shall have been done, it will be found that, barring omissions and additions, the emended Vatican codex, even in the proper names, does not deviate very considerably from the consonants of the received Hebrew text, while in point of pronunciation (treatment of the laryngals, vocalization) it represents a tradition antedating the masoretic. In this, of course, lies the supreme importance of the Egyptian text for determining the pronunciation of Hebrew in pre-Christian times.

The tripartite reference to Septuagintal transliterations in the current commentaries and lexica (to **B**, **A**, and **Lucian**) is certainly convenient, obtained as it is from the handy volumes of Swete and Lagarde, but is unscientific and should make way for a bipartite: to post-Christian **P**, and pre-Christian **E**.

I intend to follow up the present preliminary notice with a detailed presentation of my entire investigation which I expect to complete shortly. Naturally the determination of the sub-groups and of much else besides will become more accurate as the complete induction becomes ready for tabulation. **A**

part of my future work will be devoted to an edition of the group *h* on the basis of all the nine or ten manuscripts constituting it (Cod. Suppl. Gr. 609 of the National Library at Paris may have to be included) photographs of which have been made accessible to me by the authorities of the Dropsie College; with the aid of photographs similarly obtained, I expect to edit codex 55 which shows marked relation to MSS. *fh* of the Ethiopic Version, as well as the Hexaplar recension. Ultimately I expect to print a critical edition of the Book of Joshua in Greek in the manner indicated above. If such an edition can never be final, an attempt at least may be made. By the time I am ready for it the larger Cambridge Septuagint may have advanced as far as Joshua; from the accurate collations incorporated therein much help will naturally be forthcoming.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS

MARGOLIS' "MANUAL OF TALMUDIC ARAMAIC"

A Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud: Grammar, Chrestomathy, and Glossaries. By MAX L. MARGOLIS, Ph. D., Professor in the Dropsie College. Munich: C. H. BECK'SCHE VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG (New York: G. E. STECHERT & Co.), 1910. xvi + 99 + 184* pages. [Title of German edition: *Lehrbuch der aramäischen Sprache des babylonischen Talmuds.*]

JEWISH science of the nineteenth century produced but one short guide to the grammar of the Aramaic idiom of the Babylonian Talmud. In the year 1865 Samuel David Luzzatto published an elementary grammar of that idiom in connection with a grammar of Biblical Aramaic; the book appeared subsequently in a German (1873), English (1876), and Hebrew (1880) translation. This work of the famous author, one of the most noted pathfinders of the modern science of Judaism, was of too small a compass to satisfy the demands for an accurate presentation of the language of the Babylonian Talmud. Several monographs (as Rosenberg's *Das aramäische Verbum im Babylonischen Talmud*, 1888, and Liebermann's *Das Pronomen und das Adverbium*, 1895) offered valuable contributions for that purpose. The merit, however, of producing the first systematic grammar of the Aramaic idiom of the Babylonian Talmud on a comprehensive scale was reserved for the mighty step forward which Jewish studies in America took toward the end of the nineteenth century. From 1897 to 1900, Caspar Levis published serially in the volumes of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* his Grammar of the Babylonian Talmud; the work also appeared in book-form (Cincinnati 1900). A plan for a similar work had some years previously been conceived by another American scholar. As far back as 1894, as we

learn from the Preface to the work constituting the subject of the present review, a suggestion for the plan in question came to Dr. Margolis who was the author of two valuable publications dealing with the textual criticism of the Talmud, from Professor H. L. Strack, of the University of Berlin. While the work was delayed by a series of external circumstances, it nevertheless did not rest entirely; it resulted at last in the publication of the "Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud" which appeared at the beginning of the present year and forms the third part of the *Clavis Linguarum Semiticarum* edited by Professor Strack.

In its external appearance, the new Manual follows closely the style of Strack's Hebrew Grammar with the ninth edition of which the series just mentioned opens. Margolis' work is divided into two parts: a Grammar (pp. 1-97) and a Chrestomathy (pp. 1*-83*) to which are attached two Glossaries (pp. 84*-184*). What gives to the first part its singular value is the circumstance that it offers, over and above an Introduction, a Phonology, and a Morphology, also a *Syntax*, which is thus the first attempt at a systematic presentation of the syntactical peculiarities of the language of the Babylonian Talmud, neither Luzzatto nor Levis having treated of this part of the grammar. In the four subdivisions of his syntactical work (pp. 62-97), in connection with which Nöldeke's Syriac and Mandaic Grammars served as a model (p. viii), Margolis has deviated from the principle of conciseness almost carried to excess which marks the other portions of the Grammar: the rules are illustrated by a wealth of well selected examples which are accompanied by excellent renditions.

The conciseness just referred to in the paragraphs dealing with Phonology and Morphology renders the use of the book a trifle difficult. Nevertheless, the *certainty* and *clearness* with which the phenomena of the language are comprehended in rules and paradigms readily assist in surmounting the difficulty inherent in the extraordinary brevity of expression. The reader feels that he is everywhere treading upon the safe ground of manuscript tradition and of a rich collection of material resulting from an independent study of the Talmudic texts. In addition to the one

only complete manuscript of the Talmud (Munich), the author has also made use of several other manuscripts of the Talmud for the purpose of ascertaining the correct orthography and grammatical forms. In this connection one is surprised to find missing from the list of manuscript sources (p. xv) the large fragment of the tractate *Keritot*, the oldest extant manuscript portion of the Babylonian Talmud (it dates from the year 1123), which has been made accessible through publication by S. Schechter and S. Singer (*Talmudic Fragments*, 1896) and which contains many noteworthy peculiarities (see the writer's review in *JQR.*, IX (1897), 145-151).

Both in the formulation and grouping of the rules and in the construction of the paradigms the author has been successful in realizing the greatest measure of completeness within the smallest possible compass in connection with the presentation of that which is most essential in the material. In particular, the *paradigms* which occupy more than half of the space allotted to the Morphology, deserve to be singled out. They do not consist in the customary enumeration of the inflectional forms of one and the same verbal root (or of one and the same noun) among which are thus included forms nowhere to be met with; the author has rather chosen to incorporate in the rubrics of his paradigms solely such forms of the most varied origin as actually occur. Each single form which figures in his paradigms actually occurs in the sources; thus the paradigm loses its artificial character and serves in itself as a direct introduction to the living linguistic material deposited in the texts of the Babylonian Talmud. The paradigms are supplemented by the first division of the Chrestomathy in which, with constant references to the paragraphs of the Grammar, each form appearing in the paradigms is illustrated by a large group of diverse examples derived from the texts.

A further scientific merit attaches to the manner in which the author conceived his function as a grammarian in that, within the Aramaic texts of the Babylonian Talmud, he sedulously distinguishes those portions which exhibit remnants of an *earlier* form of the language (see p. 2 f.) from those in which the

common Aramaic vernacular of Babylonian Jewry manifests itself. Archaic (or non-Babylonian) forms are marked in the Grammar by a prefixed †, while in the Chrestomathy the earlier linguistic material is placed in separate sections (designated by the letter A).—Interesting is the observation that in the Munich manuscript “there is a tendency towards reducing the earlier language to the level of the later and common speech” (p. 3).

Two circumstances are prejudicial to the usefulness of Margolis' Grammar so eminently suited for the scientific study of the Aramaic language of the Babylonian Talmud: the grammatical forms are given *without vowel points*, and throughout no *references* are attached even to rarer forms. The first defect is remedied by the fact that, in the Glossary, almost all forms occurring in the Grammar and Chrestomathy are vocalized. The other renders verification difficult, which circumstance, however, amounts to no serious defect considering the author's trustworthiness which is readily recognized. Nevertheless it would be desirable to know, for an example, whence the form **מסתכלא** for the plural feminine of the participle Itpa'al is derived; the form is adduced both in the paradigm (p. 45) and in the Chrestomathy (p. 18*). Levias (§ 372, p. 102) has **מסתכלן** only, but his reference to “Beṣah 20a” is clearly a slip of the pen. In particular, the absence of references is a matter of regret in connection with the sentences of the first division of the Chrestomathy. It would have constituted a great advantage even for the beginner to be afforded the opportunity of locating each of those pithy sentences and other elements taken out of a larger context, and thus better understanding them. The usefulness of the present Manual in introducing the student immediately to an understanding of the Talmudic texts would in this way have been enhanced. However, no blame attaches to the author in this respect. In his manuscript “the sources of each form, phrase, or sentence, were indicated. But in order to reduce the bulk and cost of the volume, it was deemed advisable to drop them in all but a few cases” (Preface, p. viii). It is to be hoped that in a subsequent edition these references will be fully restored.

The first division of the *Chrestomathy* has been adverted to. It follows the Grammar closely and contains single grammatical forms and sentences containing such forms. The sentences have been chosen with great circumspection and are well suited for the purpose of acquainting the student with the language and spirit of the Talmud. In a greater measure still this is true of the second division which contains "connected texts" of a considerably diverse size, 6 and 43 pieces all told. The six pieces occupying the first place are specimens of the "older language" (p. 34*-37*). The second and much longer group consists of anecdotes of varied contents (Numbers 1-29, p. 37*-46*), legends (Numbers 30-32, p. 46*-50*), narratives from the life of the Tannaim or Amoraim (Numbers 33-39, p. 50*-58*), texts from the "Chapter of the Saints", i. e. the third chapter of the tractate Taanit (Number 40, ten pieces, p. 58*-65*); the story of the fall of the Jewish state from Giṭṭin 55b-57a (Number 41, p. 65*-69*), wonder-stories from Baba batra 73a-74b (Number 42, p. 70*-74*); lastly of halakic texts (Berakot 2a-3a, Pesahim 102b-104a, Rosh ha-shanah 2a-3a, Giṭṭin 36a-37a). With reference to these texts, the author has adopted the praiseworthy method of selecting as a basis the form of the text of a certain manuscript source, for the most part of the Munich codex, but frequently also of the *editio princeps* (Bomberg 1520-1523), and of registering the most important variants in the footnotes. Occasionally this process has served to render the text obscure, as may be seen from some of the remarks as to details which follow below. The single pieces are introduced by parallel German and English headings which quite successfully serve to indicate the contents. I confess my inability to understand the heading of Number 22 (p. 43*).

The largest space in the book is given over to the Glossary wherein the sum total of the linguistic material found in the two parts of the Manual is treated lexically in a most exact manner. It is an excellent Glossary, arranged according to roots; the derivatives appear also separately accompanied by cross-references to the place where they properly belong. The accurate definition of each single form under each root and the adequate rendering of the meaning both in German and English are carried out con-

sistently and make the Glossary in the fullest measure minister to an understanding of the texts. The Hebrew words and phrases occurring within the Aramaic texts are recorded in a special Glossary (p. 180*-184*). In the Chrestomathy itself, these Hebrew elements are marked as such by a very practical device. I have come across some omissions in the Glossary which, however, we have reason to believe, constitute but sporadic exceptions. Thus there is wanting in the Glossary the word **מחמת** *on account of* (p. 63*, l. 4). In the Hebrew Glossary there is missing **נפה** [של רומי] of p. 42*, l. 9, as well as **חצר מות** *cemetery* of p. 44*, l. 3.

Before proceeding to a discussion of certain single passages in the work of Margolis, it may be proper to correct misprints which are relatively very few. Thus, p. 89, l. 7 from below, **ר. ובנתן** (for **ובנתך**); p. 17, l. 21, **ר. ארחלא** (for **ארחלא**).

Ad p. 3. As for the spelling with **ש** in the place of **ס**, it might be observed that specifically such Aramaic words are written with **ש** as occur also in Biblical Aramaic, in consequence whereof the spelling with **ש** became current.

P. 4. The use of **א** as a vowel letter occurs much more frequently in the older witnesses of the text than in the editions.

P. 12, l. 10. **בפירוש** does not belong here; it is a Hebrew word..

P. 14, note 5. Margolis assumes for **סתמא** the pronunciation **סתִּמָּא** without an intervening vowel between the first two consonants (after the analogy of **שְׁתִּים**; so also in the Glossary, p. 145*). I fail to perceive the cogency of this view, unless the justification be found in the "traditional" pronunciation (the corresponding Hebrew word is likewise pronounced traditionally "*stam*"); but surely the latter is not authoritative in matters grammatical. Hebrew **סִתּוֹ** and **סִתּוֹר** may serve as analogies for **סתִּם**.

P. 18, l. 10. It is not at all beyond doubt that the independent possessive pronoun **ירי** originates in the combination of the relative pronoun with **יר**. This theory, first pronounced by Luzzatto (p. 74) and reiterated by Nöldeke (*Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 332) who, however, failed to mention Luzzatto, has been rightly objected to by Dalman (*Gramm. des jüd.-pal. Aramäisch*, p. 87); it is ignored altogether by Levias (§ 128).

P. 20. In the table of triconsonantal nominal stems two columns are given over to "*med. ע sive א*" and "*ult. ע sive א*". I do not consider it permissible to place ע and א on an equal footing in the classification of roots. The forms which serve as an occasion therefor (as טונא from טוענא, פיקא from פיקעא) are sporadic phonetic phenomena.

P. 32. In the list of cardinal numbers, the masculine numerals are given as feminine, and the feminine as masculine. Of course, the author has in mind the morphological fact; accordingly, in the Syntax (p. 73), the functional construction of masculine numerals with feminine objects and conversely is correctly stated. But in a practical Manual the function should have been mentioned at the very start on the occasion of the enumeration of the numerals so as to preclude any misconception. Nöldke, whom Margolis is in the habit of following both in his Syriac Grammar (p. 86) and in his Mandaic Grammar (p. 187), makes the syntactical function the basis of his table of cardinals, and not the grammatical form. In this instance the author has apparently followed Strack's example in the Hebrew Grammar; but then he ought to have made the heading to read after the fashion of Strack: "Masculine Forms joined to Feminine Objects", and conversely.

P. 75. In the clause מתפסת בננבי the preposition ב does not signify "into the thieves" but "together with thieves".

P. 76, l. 17. The courteous address by means of מר ("lord") is reproduced in the translation by the corresponding English manner of address ("to you, you"; in the German edition: "Ihnen", "Sie"). It is jarring to the ear when a modern mode of speech is thus obtruded upon the ancients.

P. 76, l. 17: "with the epexegetical infin." But ליהוי which is alluded to is no infinitive, but imperfect 3 pers. sing. masc. with the relative conjunction.

P. 78, l. 12. The admonition of Raba to his disciples from Berakot 35b appears here as well as in the Chrestomathy, p. 26*, l. 18, with the reading דלא תהון קמאי (after the Munich MS), whereas on p. 90, l. 19, the reading לא תתחוו קמאי is given.

P. 93, l. 8. The form in which the sentence is given differs from that which it has in the story concerning Abba Hilḥiah

(Taanit 23b) which is printed in full on p. 62* of the Chrestomathy; in a third form on p. 94, l. 6 f. from below.

P. 95, l. 8. The sentence adduced appears in full on p. 77, l. 16; the renderings vary (at least in the German edition).

P. 97. "Sometimes the conditional particle is dispensed with entirely". The first of the two examples, **בְּתֵר נִנְבֵּא נִנּוּב וְטַעְמָא טַעוּם** (Berakot 5b), however, is no conditional clause at all; two imperatives are merely joined, of which the first takes the place of a conditional clause; but there is no occasion for the employment of a conditional particle.

P. 5*, note 1: "Bar N. = Jīṣḥaḳ bar Joh. N." Dele "Joh." (= **יֹחָנָן**); **ר' יִצְחָק נִפְתָּא** was not the son of R. Johanan.

P. 6*. The proverb from Erubin 3a appears here in a different version from below p. 21*, last line.

P. 7*, l. 12. The proverb concerning poverty which is becoming to the Jews (Hagigah 9b) opens here with the word **נָאָה** which is designated as Hebrew. As a matter of fact, however, the first word must have been originally **יֵאִיא**, which became corrupted into **יֵאִי** or **יֵאָה**. So in the Palestinian sources where the proverb is ascribed to Aḳiba (cf. my *Agada der Tannaiten*, I², 282). The reading **נָאָה**, for **יֵאָה** of the Talmud editions, is presumably found in the Munich MS., but is nevertheless nothing but the Aramaic adjective replaced by the more current Hebrew.

P. 25*, l. 11. In the sentence **הוּא יֵאִי וְנֹלְתִיהָ יֵאִי** (from Baba batra 111a) the feminine form **יֵאִיא** (**יֵאִיהָ**) should be placed for the second **יֵאִי**. In this form it is quoted by Levy (I, 311a) according to the reading of the 'Aruk.

P. 27*, l. 8 from below. In the sentence **לֹא נֵאִי לְהוּ יוֹהֵרָא לְנִשִּׁי** (from Megillah 14b) read **יֵאִי** for **נֵאִי**. Here likewise the Munich MS. simply replaces the Aramaic adjective by the Hebrew.

P. 34*. At the end of Number 2, in the place of **נַע** read **נָר**, as the editions rightly have it Shabbat 63b. **נַע** of the Munich MS. (not registered by Rabbinowicz) represents a modification which is not justified. According to Levy (III, 353b), the whole clause **נָר נָר וְלָר** is Hebrew.

P. 38*. Under Number 5 is given (from Shabbat 26a) the anecdote concerning the cruel mother-in-law. The latter says to

her daughter-in-law, **וילי ואתלי אשרנא**; which, according to the Glossary (p. 178), means. "Go and light the lamp". But then the preposition **א** yields no sense. The same is true of the clause which follows: **אזלא ואיתלאי אשרנא**. Either the **א** before **שרנא** should be removed (as in the editions), or the verb should be taken in a different sense (perhaps *Itpe'el*, in the sense: *lift oneself up*).

P. 40*. Number 14, from Shabbat 151b, should have concluded with the interpretation of the school of Ishmael (**גלגל** (**הוא שחזור בעולם**) which follows in the texts the quotation from Deut. 15, 10 (**בגלל**); without that, the piece yields no sense.

P. 40*, l. 2 from below. After **ההוא יומא** insert the word **דאינסיבא** which is found in the Munich MS.

P. 61*, l. 4 from below. After **עלמא** the word **בחרובא** is missing which is indispensable for the sense.

P. 64*. In the clause (from Taanit 25a): **מי שאמר לשמן והדליק** the Hiphil would have to be taken in the sense of the Kal in order to make sense. Such is apparently not the intent of the author; at least the Glossary is silent concerning it. Hence we ought to replace the reading of G (=MS. of the University Library at Göttingen) with that of the editions (**וידלוק** both times; in the first place, **ורלק** would be more correct). The reading with the Hiphil is found also in M which has in both places **שירליק**. In that case the original will have read for both verbs **שירלוק**.

P. 152*. The query with regard to the Persian origin of **פרדכשא** may be well left out; the same holds good of the query at **תכחקא** (p. 177*).

The above corrections may testify to the attention with which I have gone through the excellent Manual of Margolis. It offers within a narrow compass a wealth of information and is preeminently qualified to advance the philological study of the Talmud and to serve as an introduction thereto.

The Editors have been kind enough to let me see the foregoing review in proof, and with their permission and that of Professor Bacher I append the following remarks:

The form **מסתכלא** occurs Pes. 113b Bomb.

In the clauses **אולא ואיתלאי אשרנא, זילי ואתלי אשרנא** I supply an object and translate: "Go and light (a fire) at the lamp", "She went and lit (a fire) at the lamp". The verbal forms are clearly *Afel*. Rashi paraphrases correctly: **הִדְלִיק**. Comp. Pes. 103b M **בשרנא** **נִתְלִיה נורא**, where **נִתְלִיה** is an error for **מִתְלִי**, comp. RSHbM MS. Munich **קא מתלי נורא דשרנא**. Rabbinowicz (on *Shabbat*) has entirely failed to understand the verbal forms in M.

In the clause **מי שאמר לשמן והדליק יאמר לחומין וידליק** I take the *Hifil* forms in the sense of an "inner causative". My silence in the Glossary is due to the fact that I considered the force of the *Hifil* just referred to amply treated in the current text-books of Hebrew grammar. The reading of G seems to me to be correct.

MAX L. MARGOLIS

FRIEDLAENDER'S "ARABIC WRITINGS OF MIAMONIDES."

Selections from the Arabic Writings of Maimonides. Edited with introduction and notes by ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1909. pp. xxiii + 130, 8°. No. XII of the *Semitic Study Series* edited by Richard J. H. Gottheil and Morris Jastrow, Jr.

It was a happy thought on the part of the editors of the *Semitic Study Series* to have Judeo-Arabic represented, and in the person of the famous Moses ben Maimon. It is the more useful and necessary as the great Arabists have neglected this department of Arabic literature, under the pretence that Jewish Arabic is not good Arabic, is not classical, is under the influence, grammatically and stylistically, of the Hebrew. And this, too, seems to have been said without a thorough study of the Jewish Arabic writers, and a comparison of the Mohammedan writings of the same class (see Steinschneider, *Arab Lit.*, Introd., p. xxxi f.). Prof. Friedlaender, wisely chosen to prepare this volume as being among the best Arabists in this country and one who has made the language and style of Maimonides his special work for a number of years, argues in the introduction to the volume under review as well as in two other works bearing on the same subject, that the opinion current regarding Judeo-Arabic has no basis in fact; that most of the peculiarities of the Jewish-Arabic dialect can be paralleled in the scientific writings of Arabs of pure blood, Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'a, for example, and that more similarities will be found as the so-called Middle Arabic becomes better known, and its grammatical structure is more carefully studied. He admits that the Jewish writers approach the popular or "vulgar" Arabic more closely than do the Mohammedan Arabs. But he does not charge this circumstance to Jewish or Hebrew influence, and rather finds therein an added interest, which should make the

study of the Jewish Arabic writers even more valuable for following the natural development of the language than the writings of the pure Arabs. The latter were kept by religious, hence externally superimposed, motives to the usage hallowed by the Koran. This was an artificial check on the spontaneous development of the language, which widened gradually the gulf between the written and the spoken language. The separation was greatest in books dealing with religious subjects. It was less as the writings were more remote from the subject of religion. Hence, in Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'a, who writes a history of physicians, we find deviations from the classical Arabic in the direction of the vulgar dialect. The Jews had no religious scruples to prevent them from following their bent, and hence the form which the Arabic takes with them is a result of natural development. Hebrew influence is out of the question, as it is not likely that a language used for writing and for learned purposes only should influence the habit of daily speech in all relations of life. The few Hebrew words and phrases found in the Jewish writers argue nothing against the statement just made, for they are very few, and represent a few technical terms for which there is no precise equivalent in Arabic. They do not in any way tend to modify the grammar of the language.

In 1902 Prof. Friedlaender published a work entitled "*Der Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides, ein lexikalischer und grammatischer Beitrag zur Kenntnis des Mittelarabischen, I, Lexikalischer Teil*". We have there an examination of Maimonides' vocabulary, which serves as a supplement to existing Arabic lexicons. He there promises to treat in Part II of the Grammar of Maimonides. We are still waiting for that part to appear, for upon the details given there will depend, in a great measure, the judgment of Arabists regarding Dr. Friedlaender's views of the Judeo-Arabic dialect. In the meantime, we have, in the introduction to the little volume under review, in twenty-two brief paragraphs, a list of the grammatical and syntactical peculiarities of Maimonides with references to the text which follows and to the standard grammars of Caspari-Müller and Wright, and the writings of Fleischer, Nöldeke, and Spitta. Thus, almost all the peculiarities of Maimonides appear

in the grammars mentioned, which are based upon the writings of Mohammedans.

The occasional vowel signs and other diacritical points in the text are judiciously distributed with a view to the needs of the beginner and the one who is not accustomed to read Arabic in Hebrew characters. The grammatical foot-notes and references to Wright and Caspari-Müller are also very valuable for the student of Arabic, who in general may be tempted to content himself with the first part of Socin. The notes are intended to give assistance which is beyond the Grammar and the lexicon, and they are especially full in the explanation of Rabbinical citations, with a view here especially to the needs of the non-Jewish reader. A number of misprints are corrected in the notes. A few others noticed in a rapid reading of the text are p. 2, l. 5, ותסתדל, instead of ותסתדל; 16, 8, דאימה, instead of דאימה; 26, 13, אלא לפאט, instead of אלא לפאט; 27, 7, ובה, instead of ובהא; 30, 6, ואלאסטקסאת ins. of ואלאסטקסאת (so Freytag and Wahrmond); 30, 15, אלפעאל probably instead of אלפעאל; 56, 1, וימילון, instead of וימילון; 59, 8, ללמטלום, instead of חתי; 64, 4, ואכר, instead of ואכר; 69, 1, חילום, instead of חילום; *ib.* חילה instead of חילה. חילה (29,2) are, I think, technical terms, and are best rendered, "continuity and discreteness," rather than "connection and separation". Aristotle in the *Categories* (c. 6) divides the category of quantity ($= \pi o s \acute{o} n = \text{כמות} = \text{כמות}$) into "discrete" ($\delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \nu = \text{מתחלק} = \text{מתחלק}$) and "continuous" ($\sigma \upsilon \nu \epsilon \chi \acute{\epsilon} \varsigma = \text{מחברק} = \text{מחברק}$) [see Munk, *Guide*, I 234, n. 1]. Mathematical solid or body ($\sigma \acute{o} \mu \alpha = \text{גשם} = \text{גשם}$) belongs to the latter. In our text Maimonides speaks of God's incorporeality, that he is not a body, and has not the accidents of body. Hence he has neither **אנצאל** nor **אנצאל**, continuity or discreteness. Though body here does not mean mathematical solid, still it suggests it, since the term is the same and all body is possessed of quantity.—Aristotle's phrase of God is not $\acute{o} \varsigma \phi \iota \lambda \acute{o} \mu \epsilon \nu \nu$ (sic) $\kappa \alpha \tau \acute{o} \nu$ (98, on 30, 6 f.) but

κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον Metaph. Λ. 7, p. 1072^b 3. —The commentator of Aristotle referred to p. 57, 6 is called in English Philoponus. *Philopone* (119) is the French spelling.

I should say a word about the selections. There are five in all, of which the first is from Maimonides' introduction to the eleventh chapter of the treatise Sanhedrin in his Commentary on the Mishna. The second is from the *Sefer ha-Miṣwot*, which serves as an introduction to the Code, known as *Miṣneh Torah*, or *Yad ha-Ḥazakah*. The last three are taken from his famous philosophical work, the *Guide of the Perplexed*. The first of these three is from the introduction; the second, from the seventy-first chapter of the first part on the rise of the *kalām* in Jewish literature; the third is the twelfth chapter of the third part, on the problem of evil. The more technical portions of the "Guide" were not drawn upon, as they would not illustrate specially the language of Maimonides, and besides are not adapted to the needs and interests of the general student of Arabic literature.

It would, however, add to the interest and completeness of the series if the editors would include in their list philosophical texts, with a view especially to the philosophical terminology, which is not adequately treated in the existing lexicons.

Gratz College

ISAAC HUSIK

PEREFERKOWITSCH'S EDITION OF BERAKOT

תלמוד בבלי על פי כתבי יד ודפוסים ראשונים: מסכת ברכות: *Talmud Babylonicum* ad codices manuscriptos editionesque veterrimas correctum et completum edidit N. PEREFERKOWITSCH, S. Petersburg 1909. 8 + 136 pp., 8°.

A critical edition of the Babylonian Talmud is an old desideratum of Jewish science, but the time has not yet come even to begin this task. One must first be clear about the method of procedure and solve a number of preliminary questions. A mere collection of variants will not do in this case. As a popular book which was very much studied, the Talmud naturally suffered numerous additions and changes, which are extremely difficult to identify, as they were written in the same style as the original; the discussions lend themselves especially to additions, considering that the work itself plainly shows development and allows us to recognize different layers, as Friedmann has proved by some instructive examples (דבר על אודות התלמוד אם יוכל הוא להתרנם כל צרכו) (Vienna, 1885). One may doubt whether there ever was a uniform text current in the two Babylonian academies which took part in its redaction. We know that shortly after the Talmud had been written down by the Saboraim, additions by the Gaon Jehudai were incorporated into it (Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, II, 121-123). As early an author as Saadia has doubts about the authenticity of the Talmud text (*Oeuvres*, IX, 168, No. 119) and speaks of different readings (*ib.*, 167, No. 110, where a reference to אשכול III, 3 and Saadia's commentary on ברכות. 24 [ed. Wertheimer], is to be added, and in a few passages of the commentary just mentioned). The later Geonim very frequently inform their correspondents that their reading of the Talmud on which the question is based is different from that current in the Babylonian academies (comp. e. g. Harkavy's *Responsa*, No. 272). We see that even as early as the

tenth century different texts of the Talmud must have been used in different countries. In the time of the last Gaon Hai much uncertainty existed in Babylonia itself about the text in many passages. Hai in one case discusses four different readings, where our editions have a fifth (Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IV, 70). He speaks of those who, often wrongly, fix the text (נרסאי in ed. Cassel No. 78, נוסח in ed. Harkavy, No. 272), of old readings which he consulted (ed. Cassel, *l.c.*) and which differed in language though not in contents (ed. Harkavy, No. 334), and of a different version which he calls נמרא רבי רב (ed. Harkavy, No. 334, and probably 272), and which, according to Schorr (החלוץ, XIII, 85), constituted a more elaborate form of the discussions. Hai also informs us of different readings dating back to older schools (ed. Harkavy, 229). It will therefore be necessary first to reconstruct the different types of the text used in different countries just as is the case with the Septuagint and other books which have a similarly complicated textual history, before even an attempt can be made to establish the text.

A thorough examination of the Talmud quotations in the Gaonic literature, with constant attention to the academies to which the respective Geonim belong, will probably yield rich results in giving some idea of the differences between Suran and Pumbedithan texts, and by means of such results may even help to determine the authorship of Responsa in doubtful cases. We also have rich material for the Kairwan schools, in their questions addressed to the Geonim, and especially in the commentaries of its chief representatives, R. Hananel and R. Nissim.

As for the text of the Spanish school, one could follow it in its development for over four centuries, from the halakic compendium of Alfasi and the code of Ibn Ghiat down to the haggadic collection of Jacob ibn Ḥabib and the anonymous אנרות התלמוד. The codes and commentaries of authorities like Naḥmanides, Ibn Adret, R. Jom Tob b. Abraham, and R. Nissim bar Ruben, and collections like Isaak Aboab's מנורת המאור and the ילקוט, as well as the *Pugio Fidei* and numberless others, will present abundant material to the investigator. Here we even have full texts at our disposal, as Seeligman has pointed out lately

(*ZfhB.*, XII, 18-19). In addition to the fragments of the Faro edition of 1494 which Seeligman discovered, the so-called Salonica edition (*ZfhB.*, XII, 14) actually, it seems, printed at Fez (*ZfhB.*, XVI, 80) in 1521, and the Spanish MS. of חולין, a copy of יבמות which Chwolson (ראשית מעשה הדפוס בישראל, Warsaw 1897, 22) saw in London, and declares to have been printed in Guadalaxara 1482, and some fragments in Chwolson's Library (*ib.*, 28, note) should be utilized for this purpose. As Spanish texts enjoyed a great authority, even the Provencal and French scholars often refer to them and testify that certain readings are found in them (נוסח ספרדי often e. g. in R. Abraham b. David's and R. Zerachiah ha-Levi's writings; R. Tam in Northern France refers to such readings). It would be interesting to examine the relations of these Spanish texts to those of the Geonim, as we know that their texts were directly received from Babylonia (*JQR.*, XVIII, 401. 770).

Much greater difficulties are presented by the Italian and Franco-German type. For the former the Aruk is our main source, which at the same time utilizes Gaonic, Kairwan, and German commentaries, and is therefore to be used with great discrimination. The later Italian scholars are strongly influenced by other countries. Yet Italian readings may have a special interest, as the Italians possibly obtained their text of the Talmud with their explanations from Palestine as I have suggested elsewhere (*ZfhB.*, XIII, 74). In the Franco-German text again a rather large number of conjectural corrections have been introduced by Rashi, R. Tam, R. Samuel b. Meir, and their schools, and it will require much labor to determine as far as possible what is a conjecture and what are original readings. On the other hand, our material for this Franco-German version is especially rich, as it is represented by the only complete MS. of the Talmud, the famous Codex Munich 95, and perhaps also the text of the editions; the old Mayence commentary, Rashi, and the work of the Tosafot, the numerous codes by the Franco-German authors and perhaps the Yalkuṭ, the fatherland of which will only be finally settled by an investigation into the texts of the Talmud and Midrashim it used, will give ample material for control. The Provencal authorities will in all probability prove to have utilized interpolated texts showing the

influence of Spanish as well as German MSS. The Yemen texts that have come to light during the last few years, add another type of the text in the large quotations occurring in the Midrash Ha-Gadol and other compilations, and some Talmudic MSS. of Columbia College. They show, for instance, remarkable differences in orthography. Another new problem is added by the Genizah texts, which mostly come from the East, the evidence of the indirect tradition there being very scarce. They can only be applied with advantage after the different leaves of single MSS. that are distributed among several libraries have been identified and put together. Then they will probably prove most important on account of their age.

The problem confronting any editor of a critical edition is thus, as we have seen, very intricate, the task is a gigantic one, and could only be accomplished by collaboration on the part of many prominent scholars. It will have to be preceded by many researches such as Margolis's dissertation: *Commentarius Isaacidis quatenus ad textum Talmudis investigandum adhiberi possit, tractatu Erubhin ostenditur* (New York 1891). It would be a good beginning to reconstruct e. g. the Spanish version of those treatises for which we have complete texts like עירובין (ed. Salonica 1521 in Frankfurt a. M.), קירושין (ed. Salonica in the British Museum; cf. Van Straalen, *Supplement*, 234 and corrections p. vii), יבמות (see above), and חולין (the old MS. Hamburg 169; cf. Seeligman, *l.c.*, p. 19), with a full apparatus of all the variations offered by compendia, commentaries, and codes of Spanish authors.

To give a larger and safer basis to the textual criticism at present, it would be the best and most feasible way to publish a correct transcript, not a photographic reproduction, of the Munich MS. with the variants of the first Bomberg edition and the editions by the Soncinos (*ZjhB.*, VIII, 143-144). Eventually the variants from Codex Oxford 366 might be added, which, it seems, represents an eastern type and contains a considerable part of the Talmud (see *OLZ.*, III (1900), 135). Such a publication should begin with those parts of the Talmud which are not covered by the vast collection of variants of the late Rabinowicz and for which we have at present no reliable material whatsoever for

textual criticism. This could serve in a way as a basis for further researches, and collations of the other codices could gradually be added thereto. But, of course, this could not be called a critical edition. It is evident that, as long as a separation of the material according to the above types has not been made, a critical edition is impossible, and any attempt to establish one would be at present delusive. One can free the current text from the worst mistakes with the aid of Rabbinowicz' work, which, though deserving the highest praise, is not very clearly arranged and unfortunately incomplete. Friedmann tried this in his edition of the treatise Makkot, published by the seventh Congress of Orientalists, with considerable success, but the title "Kritische Edition" is misleading.

The above remarks have been suggested by the appearance of a new text of the treatise ברכות by Mr. Pereferkowitsch, which follows a different editorial principle, and can much less be approved than that of Friedmann. His text is eclectic and does not follow any certain authority. He arbitrarily follows one text or another in the same line without sufficient reason, and so gives a new text which never existed and has no sound basis. An analysis of a few lines will prove the justice of this contention. I choose p. 2, l. 19-30, the part contained in the first Genizah fragment (= G) of which a facsimile is given. L. 20 f. G, P, (= Paris MS.) and O (= Oxford MS.) read חנניה for חנינא, a variant which ought to have been mentioned; 22 and 24 the אמרת of ed. and G is changed into סלקא דעתך with M (= Munich MS.) and P; l. 23 after דבהן לחור ed. GP rightly repeat שמע מנה which is missing in M, while in l. 25 after מאוחר even M repeats it. Yet it is omitted in the new edition. L. 23 לאו שמע מנה, the לאו is omitted in P but extant in all other MSS.; as it is left here, it ought to have remained in l. 25 in the same formula, though there MP omit it; l. 26-27 the reading of P which is found (as a gloss) in M after that of our editions is introduced in the text, and in one place הלכך מבעור יום טובלין is replaced by וכי טובלין מבעור יום טובלין of the Aruk; the reading of GM is given as variant and for קא אמינא which is supported by the parallelism, סבירא ליה (read לי) of G is supplied; l. 29 דתניא is only found in G, all other texts read דאמר, which is correct; l. 31-32 the reading of MPO and other old authorities is passed over in

silence. All these points are only *minutiae*, but they show that the whole method of procedure is based on a wrong principle. One ought not to change the text which serves as a basis for an edition if the new reading is not positively better. In case both are equal, one should abstain from unnecessary changes. Lack of consistency is also shown on the following page, where ל' l. 14 ought to have been given as variation like l. 4. According to Solomon Duran, it does not belong to the text (cf. Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IV, 74), but there is room for doubt in this case. I do not intend to go into any further details. An examination of the text at different places shows the same result. The editor, in the introduction, points to the school editions of classical authors as his models. He forgets that an *editio minor* is only possible where an *editio major* is in existence as with all classical authors. If Friedmann's edition is not "critical in the full sense of the word," his is much less so. Neither can I agree with his comparison of Lowe's edition of the Mishna and Theodor's בראשיתרנא. A reprint of a single MS. without variations and corrections is only justified in a few special cases as with the Vatican and Alexandrine text of the Septuagint. If Lowe did not know of the Parma MS. of the Mishna, he ought to have corrected his MS. according to the first edition of the Palestinian Talmud where necessary, and a full collation of this text ought to have been added. As it is, he only gave material for an edition, but his book does not deserve to be called an edition. Theodor, on the other hand, follows the MS. which in his judgment is the best extant, and only puts other readings into his text where they are undoubtedly better. There is room for discussion only in detailed cases; his principle will be recognized by everybody as correct.

Except for the principal objection to the manner in which he establishes his text, Pereferkowitsch's edition deserves full praise. His arrangement of the text, references to the sources, introduction of brackets, and modern typographical conveniences, facilitate the reading and make the text more accessible to the inexperienced reader. One only misses short explanatory notes like those in Friedmann's edition, without which the text will often be unintelligible to those for whom it is intended. The variations, especially where they consist of more than a single word, ought

to have been put in foot-notes, as they interrupt and disturb the context. The editor had for about a third of his text 27 different Genizah fragments, six pages of which he gives in facsimile. It would have been advisable to publish important variations found there in an appendix, especially those incorporated into his text. If in the future sections of his edition Mr. Pereferkowitsch will give a more uniform text and state his authorities where he supplies other readings, his work will be very welcome and prove useful until the time arrives when some such plan as has been indicated above can be carried out, after which alone a definite edition of the Talmud can be attempted.

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America.

ALEXANDER MARX

BENTWICH'S PHILO

Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria. BY NORMAN BENTWICH. Philadelphia: THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA, 1910. pp. 7 + 273.

MR. BENTWICH has given us in the volume under review an eminently readable and up-to-date monograph on a great writer who has suffered undeserved neglect on the part of Jews. His is not the only case in which the Rabbinic application of the biblical הלכו ובחקות הגוים לא תלכו has resulted in ironic situations not at all creditable to Jewish sense of humor or of fitness.

To illustrate from examples still evident at the present day, biblical grammar, biblical interpretation, and biblical criticism have been taken so well in hand by Christian scholars that Jews have assumed the rôle of interested onlookers. Only recently has there been a stir in the Jewish camp, expressing the sentiment that we must once more make the Bible our own.

Now there are signs that the Talmud, too, will soon cease to be a *terra incognita* to our Christian friends. Schürer and Strack are the pioneers, and Margolis's Grammar (he is a Jew) will make it easier for the younger Christian Semitists and theologians to follow in Strack's footsteps. Shall we attribute the growing neglect of the Talmud in certain Jewish circles to the circumstance just pointed out?

In ancient times the Septuagint translation was abandoned by the Jews because the Christian Church adopted it, and the caricature of Aquila was substituted in its place. The same fate has befallen Philo, who, with all his extravagance, unreality, and absolute want of the historical sense, was at heart a loyal and enthusiastic Jew. His treatises and his sermons are not inferior to the Palestinian and Babylonian Midrash, and if they had been studied by the Jews of the succeeding centuries, would have kept

alive a broader culture among the Jews of the early Middle Ages, and would have prepared them for a more general and more intelligent reception of the spirit emanating from the Judæo-Spanish writers.

Philo's language, it is true, was against him, since the bulk of the Jews who lived in Palestine, and especially in Babylon, in the following centuries, did not know Greek. At the same time it would seem that the very circumstance that the New Testament writings were in Greek made that speech a *lingua non grata* among the Jews.

It seems, according to some, that Jews had a hand in translating the Scriptures into Syriac (Peshitta) in Mesopotamia in the second century.

In the succeeding centuries, especially in the fifth and sixth and following, i. e. in Talmudic times, and in Mesopotamia, the Talmudic land, the Nestorian and Monophysite Christians were extremely active in conducting theological and scientific schools in which the scientific material wholly, the theological for the most part, was derived from Greek sources. There was an important school of translators in Edessa, in the fourth and fifth centuries, in which Greek works of theology, philosophy, and science were rendered into Syriac by Christian scholars. Similar schools were established soon after in Nisibis and Gandisapora. The Jews living in those lands could thus without any difficulty, had they been so disposed, have had access to the Greek language and its literature. But there seems to be no evidence in the Rabbinic writings that there were any relations of an intellectual character between the Babylonian Jews and the Mesopotamian schools of the Syrian Christians.

Philo, it seems clear, was not known to the Talmudists. Poznański's article in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, 1895, calling attention to a possible trace of Philo in a Karaitic fragment or two of the ninth or tenth century is extremely interesting, though not quite conclusive. The one passage upon which he bases his chief claim, in which reference is made to the "Muḳaddamāt (Introductions) of the Alexandrian" and his answers given to the question, why God gave the ten commandments in the desert and

not in an inhabited land, has a remarkable resemblance to an extant passage in Philo. At the same time it is sufficiently divergent in the classification of the answer and in the example to one part of it to make it doubtful whether it was taken directly from Philo.

Azariah dei Rossi in the sixteenth century was the first to make an attempt after sixteen centuries of neglect to rehabilitate Philo among the Jews, and ironically enough he had to have recourse to a Latin translation made by Christians.

In other words, it was Christians during that long interval who kept him for us in the original, and who translated him. The early Christian church had a great fondness for him, and cited him next to Plato to prove that even in pre-Christian times an intimation of the Trinity was vouchsafed to certain wise men. A passage was selected in his treatise *De Abrahamo* in which, commenting on the various names of God in the Bible, he distinguishes in particular three, which he renders in Greek, ὁ Ὡν, Θεός and Κύριος. These correspond to יהוה (אֱלֹהִים), and אֲדֹנֵי. The first is the Father of all, he says, standing in the middle, and guarded on both sides by his two eldest and nearest Powers, the Creative and the Regal, so that he gives the mind the appearance sometimes of one, sometimes of three. (Δορυφορούμενος σὺν ὁ μέσος ὑφ' ἑκατέρας τῶν δυνάμεων παρέχει τῇ ὁρατικῇ διανοίᾳ τοτὲ μὲν ἑνὸς τοτὲ δὲ τριῶν φαντασίαν).

Dei Rossi's praiseworthy endeavor was, however, abortive, and Philo had to wait for the nineteenth century to receive the treatment he deserves at the hands of Jewish scholars. As a philosopher and theologian he had been adequately studied and expounded by historians of Greek philosophy, as well as by those who were tracing the antecedents and origins of Christian theological dogma.

The Jewish writers, therefore, for the most part endeavored to establish his position as a Jew, in particular the relations of his exposition of the Bible to the Palestinian Haggadah and Halakah.

Bentwich summarizes for the non-specialist in pleasant fashion Philo's environment, life, character, and teaching in its various phases and relations.

He vindicates his hero's Jewishness against all aspersions, in which laudable attempt he is quite successful if regard is had purely to Philo's intention. The matter is debatable if we extend the defense to Philo's method and actual achievement. He sailed close to the wind in his allegorizations, on the one hand, in his personifications on the other. The one was in danger of leading, as it actually did in Christianity, to antinomianism, the other to pluralism. There was some justification in a critical period for repudiation of his method on the part of the Synagogue.

Interesting is the author's discovery of a progress in Philo's ethical doctrine from his earlier to his more mature writings. In the former, we are told, he is an uncompromising ascetic, in the latter an advocate of the middle way, and sensible of the importance of social life.

The author lays stress on Philo's missionary aim. Moses he holds out as the greatest of all men, and the most perfect that ever lived; the law of Moses as the only enduring law, stamped with the seal of nature, and alone capable of bringing about the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

Bentwich's book fills a long-felt want, and forms a valuable addition to the Society's publications and a fit companion to the volumes on Maimonides and Rashi in the series of Jewish Worthies, of which it forms a part.

Gratz College

ISAAC HUSIK

THE ANCIENT JEWISH ALLEGORISTS IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH

BY JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Huntsville, Ala.

IN the Talmud and in the Midrashim interpretations of scriptural passages are occasionally quoted in the name of two classes of unknown ancient teachers, called דורשי רשומות, "*Dorshe Reshumot*," and דורשי חמורות, "*Dorshe Hamurot*," respectively. We never hear anything else about them. But they must have been among the very earliest Jewish interpreters of the Scriptures, for their interpretations and sayings are mentioned in sources so remote as the older halakic Midrashim, such as Sifre and Mekilta, and Tannaites of the first and the second generations are said to have explained some scriptural passages in their style and according to their exegetical method.¹ But who the old exegetes were, to what school or schools they belonged, what their tendency was, what method they applied in interpreting the Scripture, and why they were

¹ Many sayings of R. Johanan b. Zakkai are described as being בפני חמר, which, as we shall see, means, in the style and the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot*. Similarly, Joshua b. Hananiah and Eleazar Hisma declare a scriptural passage to be רשום, which, as we shall see, means that it is to be interpreted in the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*. According to Lekah Tob on Deut. 18, 3, it is Joshua b. Hananiah who quotes the saying of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, which, in Sifre Deut. 165, is quoted by Judah b. Ilai, and R. Akiba quotes the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* in Kohelet r. x. 1, see also below, p. 321.

designated as "*Dorshe Reshumot*" and "*Dorshe Hamurot*"—of all this nothing is said in the talmudic-midrashic literature.

The old commentators of the Talmud, like Rashi, the Aruk, and the Tosafot, tried to explain the meaning of the appellatives "*Reshumot*" and "*Hamurot*"; following their lead, some modern Jewish scholars have advanced various theories about these ancient exegetes. But all the explanations hitherto given of the words "*Reshumot*" and "*Hamurot*," and the theories based upon them by modern Jewish scholars are far from satisfactory. A correct and true opinion about them, their method, and their tendency, can be obtained only by means of careful and critical study, which should examine thoroughly the following three possible sources of information: (1) The historic data, the reports about these ancient teachers, provided such are to be found in ancient Jewish literature. (2) The meaning of the names applied to them, especially of the words רשומות and חמורות forming part of these names, for it may be safely assumed that the names *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot* were chosen to designate definitely and accurately the tendency or the method of each of the two classes of exegetes respectively. (3) The sayings and interpretations of these teachers that have been preserved, for from these sayings taken in the aggregate we should be able to abstract the method they applied in interpreting the Scriptures, the purpose they aimed at through their interpretations, and their peculiar views about the scriptural word and its meaning. Regarding the first of these three sources, namely, historical reports, none is to be found in the Talmud or in any of the Midrashim. As stated above, nothing is said about the two classes of exegetes in the talmudic-midrashic

literature. They seem to be ignored persistently by the teachers of the traditional law, except inasmuch as some of their sayings are mentioned. Mishnah Soṭah ix. 9-15 mentions many classes of prominent men in ancient Jewry as pious men, men of faith, men of good, practical, social work; also schools of diligent students, interpreters, poets, scholars, and the time is given till when each school or group of men lived and worked, together with the name of the last of each school or class.² We might fitly expect to find among them our two classes of interpreters of the Scriptures, with the data that are reported about the others. But they are ignored here as elsewhere. We find often that when the Rabbis of the Talmud mention an ancient name they couple with it a question about its meaning, and then proceed to explain it with more or less correctness. Or they ask why this man or that group of men was called by such and such a name, and they try to give a reason for it.³ But in the case of the *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot*, they merely mention one or the other of these categories in quoting a saying of theirs, but they never ask:

² The passage in the Mishnah reads thus: משמת יוסי בן יועזר איש צרידה ויוסי בן יוחנן איש ירושלים בטלו האשכולות... משחרב ביה"מ.... ופסקו אנשי אמנה... משמת ר' מאיר בטלו מושלי משלים משמת בן עזאי בטלו השקדנים. משמת בן זומא בטלו הדרשנים משמת ר"ח ב"ד בטלו אנשי מעשה משמת ר' יוסי קטנותא פסקו חסידים.

³ Thus, for instance, in Soṭah 47b, the question is asked מאי אשכולות "what is the meaning of the name אשכולות," and an explanation is given; *ibid.*, 48b, the name אנשי אמנה is explained to mean "true believers in God," and in p. Soṭah ix. 13 (24b) it is explained to mean "faithful and devoted students of the law." Mishnah Soṭah ix. 15 asks why the name "Kṣonta" was given to the last of the Ḥasidim, Jose, and a reason is given for it. In Kḥiddushin 30a a reason is given why the ancient teachers were called "Soferim." In Shabbat 33b a reason is given why Judah b. Ilai was designated as "the chief speaker," ראש המדברים; and many other similar explanations of names are found in the Talmud.

מאי דורשי רשומות or מאי דורשי חמורות, "What or who were the *Dorshe Reshumot* or the *Dorshe Hamurot*?"; nor do they attempt to explain the meaning of the names, and why certain teachers were called by them, נקרא שמם, ולמה ד' רשומות, ד' חמורות, as they do in connection with other names.

It would seem that by the end of the second century or thereabouts the rabbis felt a certain resentment towards these ancient exegetes, their method, and their tendency, and they quoted their sayings only reluctantly. Although their utterances were preserved, and their method was well known, and occasionally even followed by the rabbis of the first half of the third century,⁴ they purposely avoided giving any account of them, and sought rather to let them fall into oblivion.

But if the first source of information, direct historical reports, fails us, the other two means of ascertaining the character of these ancient exegetes and who they were are still available. We know at least the names by which they were called, and happily sayings of theirs have been preserved to us. These two sources of information are so intimately connected with each other that they are practically one and the same. For, as was said above, their names must have been applied to these teachers, because they were characteristic of their peculiar method and their tendency, both of which should be deducible by an examination of the sayings preserved to us. Obviously, any theory con-

⁴ Simon the son of R. Judah I gives an interpretation to Exod. 21, 6 which is characterized as כמין חמר, that is, in the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot* (Ḳiddushin 22b). Perhaps it was his brother Gamaliel III, who, in Soṭah 15a, gives an interpretation to a scriptural passage which he describes as being according to the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, כמין חמר.

ceived about the "*Dorshe Reshumot*" and "*Dorshe Hamurot*" must have the support of the testimony derived from their names and that derived from their sayings. In other words, a theory to be helpful, must explain satisfactorily the etymological meaning of the names, and show that they express a special tendency or a special method, and it must furthermore prove that every single interpretation handed down to us in the name of the *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot* actually shows the tendency or the method supposed from the evidence given by the names themselves to have been characteristic of them.

No such theory has been offered by any one of the scholars⁵ who have written about our ancient exegetes. None advanced by the mediæval and the modern Jewish writers offers a correct etymological definition of the words רשומות and חמורות. And again, the method which, according to one or other of these various theories, is supposed to have been characteristic of these ancient exegetes, can be shown at most only in a few of their sayings, and in none with convincing clearness.

The theory advanced in the present article seems to satisfy all the demands enumerated above. In any event, it is supported by all the evidence that can be derived from

⁵ Observations about the *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot* have been made by 'Rashi, the Aruk, and the Tosafot; by Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie*, II, 52, s. v. "Allegorie," Weiss in his *Dor Dor we-Dorshow*, I, 202, and *Middot Soferim* on Mekilta, 83b, 53a, and 61a; Kohut in *Aruch Completum*, s. v. חמר; Brüll, *Jahrbuch*, I, 181 ff; Joseph Perles, *REJ.*, 109 ff; Isidore Weil, *ibid.*, III, 276 ff; Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, I, 62, s. v. חמר, and 183 ff., s. v. רשום; Zunz, *GV.*, 336; Eisenstein, *Ozar Israel*, s. v. דורשי רשומות. But none of these scholars considered and examined all the sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot* that have been preserved. All those found in Mekilta d. R. Simeon and in Midrash Hagadol were altogether unknown to them.

the three available sources of information. It offers a characteristic mark of the method peculiar to our anonymous interpreters of the Scriptures, and shows clearly that this method has been used in each and every one of their sayings. It gives a satisfactory explanation of the etymological meaning of the words *Reshumot* and *Hamurot*, which form their names, and shows that these names were chosen aptly to characterize the peculiarity of these exegetes, since they convey adequately the method applied by them in interpreting the Scripture. The present theory is, besides, confirmed by what is known about these ancient Jewish interpreters of the Scripture from reliable sources outside of the Talmud and the Midrashim. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the teachers of the traditional law had sufficient cause for the resentment they felt towards these exegetes and for objecting to their tendency. Thus, finally, will be explained the persistent silence observed by the rabbis of the Talmud about these ancient interpreters of the Scripture, and why only a few⁶ of their interpretations have been preserved in the talmudic-midrashic literature.

The hypothesis advanced by Rashi⁷ and accepted by the majority of modern scholars, that the *Dorshe Reshumot*

⁶ Altogether we have fourteen interpretations of scriptural passages, in the name of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, and four sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot*; to the latter must be added seven interpretations designated as being in the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot* כמין חמר. See the complete list of these sayings quoted below. It is certain, however, that there must have been many more of their interpretations and sayings. For certain reasons the rabbis of the Talmud did not care to preserve them or mention them in the name of their originators.

⁷ Rashi, Berakot 24a, s. v. דורשי רשומות, remarks ד'חמורות גרסינן והיא, "We read *Dorshe Hamurot* instead of *Dorshe Reshumot*, but both are the same." Bacher, *Terminologie*, follows Rashi, and remarks, on p. 62: "Jedenfalls bezeichnen beide Ausdrücke [*Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot*] dieselben alten Schriftausleger," and, on page 183, he mentions

and *Dorshe Hamurot* were two names given to one and the same class of teachers or exegetes, must be rejected as absolutely false. There is no valid reason for calling one class of teachers by two different names. If the two were one, how came they to be designated by two different names, seeing that these names were to characterize peculiar methods or special tendencies? It is evident that each of the two names must designate a special class⁸ of exegetes whose peculiar method or tendency it characterizes. It was merely the ignorance of the character and the tendency of the two classes of interpreters of the Scripture that made it possible to identify them with each other. The old commentators of the Talmud, unable to distinguish between the peculiarities of the two classes, believed them

the דורשי רשומות, "die auch חמורות genannt werden." Zunz, *GV.*, 336, and Kohut, *Aruch*, s. v., also identify the *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot* with each other, and neither Perles nor Weil, in their articles, l. c., distinguish between the two classes.

⁸ The first, so far as I am aware, to distinguish between the *Dorshe Reshumot* and *Dorshe Hamurot* and to recognize them as two distinct classes of exegetes was Hamburger. He remarks in his *Real-Encyclopädie*, II, 52; "Es werden zwei Klassen von Schriftforschern genannt: die Forscher der Andeutungen, דורשי רשומות, und die Forscher des buchstäblichen Textes, דורשי חמורות, von denen Erstere sicherlich Allegoristen waren." Weiss also distinguished between the two; he gives of each one of them a different definition. The *Dorshe Reshumot* he describes as allegorists, דורשי רשומות הם היו החכמים שדרשו הפסוקים בדרך משל וציור נקראו דורשי רשומות *Dor*, I, 202; and דורשי רשומות הם היו החכמים שדרשו הפסוקים בדרך משל ומליצה ורמז ויצאים מגדר הפשט שכן ענין מלת רשום *Middot Soferim* on *Mekilta*, 53. The *Dorshe Hamurot*, on the other hand, he describes as those who seek to give a reason for the law, דורשי חמורות נקראו לתורה טעם לתורה נקראו דורשי חמורות (Dor., l. c.), or those interpreters whose method was the "measure for measure" rule, מדרש דורשי חמורות הוא על דרך מדה כנגד מדה (*Middot Soferim*, 83). We shall discuss these definitions of Hamburger and Weiss later on. Both of them consider only the דורשי רשומות as allegorists, but we shall see that the דורשי חמורות were also allegorists, though of another kind and of a different school.

to be but one. This mistaken identification of two distinct classes of exegetes had the fatal consequence that the later teachers and copyists of the Talmud would often substitute one name for the other, and the result of interchanging the two names is confusion and lack of uniformity in the readings in the various editions and manuscripts of the works with which we are concerned. A saying ascribed to the *Dorshe Reshumot* in a given work is sure to be quoted in another edition, or in a manuscript of the same work, in the name of the *Dorshe Hamurot*; or *vice versa*.

It must be admitted that the two classes of exegetes were in one respect like each other. Their common characteristic was that they both interpreted the Scriptures in an allegorical sense, not according to the plain and literal meaning of the words. Nevertheless, though both were allegorists, they were absolutely distinct from each other—in origin, motive, and tendency, as well as in the method each applied in the interpretation of scriptural passages. Thus it was just that each class should be called by a special name, to distinguish it from the other.

We shall now proceed to show the different methods, tendencies, and origins of the two classes of allegoristic interpreters of the Scripture. We shall treat them separately, and we begin with the *Dorshe Reshumot*.

The definition of *Dorshe Reshumot*, given by Rashi^{*} and accepted by Bacher, *l. c.*, 184, as "interpreters of those difficult passages in the Scriptures which are unclear in the

^{*} Berakot 24a, דורשי רשומות, קשרים וסתומים הכלולים בתורה, "the *Dorshe Reshumot* are the interpreters of the knots and abstruse passages contained in the Law." It is noteworthy that in Sanhedrin 104b, Rashi describes the דורשי רשומות merely as דורשי פסוקים, "interpreters of verses or passages." Bacher characterizes the דורשי רשומות as "die Ausleger der undeutlichen, den Gedanken nur in Andeutungen enthaltenden Bibelworte."

meaning, and fail to express a thought explicitly," is absolutely wrong. All the scriptural passages on which interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot* have been preserved are very clear and distinct in the meaning of their words, and the thought, expressed by the literal meaning of their words, is far more clear and explicit than the one ascribed to them by the interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot*.¹⁰

Besides, the word רשומות cannot mean "obscure" or "difficult" passages. The singular term רשום, occurring in Mekilta, Amalek 1, ed. Weiss, 61a, with which Bacher seeks to support this definition of רשומות, has not, as he assumes, the same meaning as סתום, "abstruse" or "unintelligible." Although Yalkuṭ, in quoting this passage of the Mekilta, offers the reading סתום instead of רשום, this does not prove that סתום and רשום are identical in their meanings. By substituting the word סתום for רשום, the Yalkuṭ, or some copyist of it, attempted to explain the word רשום, the exact meaning of which he did not know. This substitute, סתום, was suggested to him by the following word ומפורש, which is often used as a contrast to סתום (comp. Bacher, *l. c.*, 137). He took רשום ומפורש to be like סתום ומפורש. But this was a misunderstanding of the meaning of the word רשום. The word רשום in the Mekilta passage is merely the singular form of the term רשומות used in the name דורשי רשומות. But the phrase: המקרא הזה: רשום does not mean, as Bacher takes it, "this scriptural

¹⁰ Bacher himself felt that this definition of *Dorshe Reshumot* is not borne out by all their interpretations, but he thinks that at least some of their interpretations are of such a nature as to justify Rashi's and his own theory. After giving his characterization of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, he adds: "Wozu wenigstens ein Teil der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Aussprüche stimmt" (*l. c.*, 184). But we shall see that not even one of their sayings justifies his definition, for all the passages interpreted by them are, without exception, very explicit in their meaning.

passage is obscure, and not distinct." It will be proved further on, where this passage of the Mekilta will be cited together with its parallel, that the phrase המקרא הזה רשום merely means: This verse of the Bible can, or is to, be considered as a רשום, that is, it can, or is to, be interpreted in the manner or according to the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*. The singular form רשום therefore in no way helps us to define the meaning of the plural form רשומות. We have to go back to the etymological meaning of the verb רשם in order to get the correct meaning of both nouns רשום and רשומות.

The verb רשם in Hebrew and Aramaic means "to mark," "to make a sign," "to signify," or "to designate," and hence also to represent symbolically,¹¹ and the noun רשום means, therefore, a visible "mark," "sign," or "symbol," which serves to indicate something or represents an idea or communicates some information. Such a sign or symbol does not completely describe the subject of which it is a sign, or which it is to symbolize, it merely reminds one of it or suggests it. Any word used in a figurative sense, to convey some idea or express some thought, is such a sign or symbol. The word in itself has its simple and literal meaning, yet if there is some resemblance between it and that which it is to symbolize, it can be used as a sign or a symbol for the latter. A word can be used as a sign for a certain idea, quality, or action, or state, if only one feature or one aspect of the idea, quality, action,

¹¹ This development of the meaning of the verb רשם can be traced also in Syriac, where the verb רשם means *delineate*, *designate* and then also *signify*, *represent symbolically*, as in the phrase, לאתתא דשינא תרשום, said of the olive branch "it should represent to us the sign of peace," and בלחמא פטירא רשימין, said of a guiltless life, "it is indicated by unleavened bread" (see J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, s. v.).

or state, can be compared with, or represented by, it, for this one feature or this one aspect, suggested by the word, will bring to mind the whole idea, etc. For this reason, also, the first word of a sentence can be used as a sign to represent the entire sentence, as one letter of a word may be used as a sign for the whole word, since the first letter or the first word will bring to mind what followed, the whole word or the whole sentence.

The name *Dorshe Reshumot*, accordingly, designates a certain class of exegetes, whose peculiar method was to see in the words of the Scripture signs or symbols and parabolical expressions, which should be taken in a figurative sense, not in their plain and literal meaning. This method was also termed מֶשַׁל, "allegoristic interpretation," to interpret the words in a metaphorical sense.¹² They did not deny that the words have a literal meaning as well, and that this literal meaning is very simple, clear, and distinct. But they thought that a merely literal interpretation of the Scripture does not do full justice to the scriptural word, does not exhaust its meaning. For some passages of the Scripture absolutely demand, and others justify, or, at least, allow an allegorical interpretation, according to which they have a metaphorical sense, and express higher ideas than those conveyed by their simple meaning. Briefly, they were allegoristic interpreters of the Scripture, and the name דֹּרְשֵׁי רִשְׁמוֹת is a true characterization of them. It expresses adequately the method

¹² See Rule 26 of the Thirty-two Rules of R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili. The three interpretations given by R. Ishmael, and characterized as being according to the method of Mashal מֶשַׁל כְּמִין (Mekilta, ed. Weiss, 88b, and Sifre Deut., ed. Friedmann, 117b) are according to the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*. They take the words not in their literal meaning, but in a figurative sense (see below pp. 328-29).

applied by them, namely, to interpret, דרש, the words as רשומות,¹³ as signs, figures, and symbols to remind us of something else than what is expressed by their literal meaning. The literal sense of a word or a passage is designated as כשמעו or כמשמעו, "according to its literal meaning." We find, accordingly, that in most places where the interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot* are mentioned, there are also mentioned other explanations, "according to the plain, literal sense", כשמעו, in contrast with their allegorical interpretations. As the literal meaning of the words was considered their true sense אמת, the contrast between the literal sense, characterized as אמת, and the allegorical or figurative sense, characterized as משל, or רשום, is expressed in a more drastic form in the phrases אם אמת אם אמת למה (Sanhedrin 92), or¹⁴ אם אמת למה אם אמת למה (p. Yebamot 13a and Genes. r. 81, 2),

¹³ The word רשומות in the name דורשי רשומות is not the object of דרש and does not designate a peculiar class of passages or particular words of the Scriptures interpreted by these exegetes. It designates the peculiar method of taking the words as symbols, by which they interpreted the Scriptures. Similarly in the phrases: דריש ריבוי ומיעוטי דרשי כללי ופרטי (Shebuot 37b), and דריש סמוכים (Yebamot 4a and Berakot 10a), the words ריבוי ומיעוטי, כללי ופרטי, סמוכים are not the object of דרש, but characterize the method; they do not designate the passages that are interpreted, but how, in what way, they are interpreted.

¹⁴ It was this contrast between the term רשום, meaning, "figurative" or "allegorical sense," and the term אמת, meaning "literally true," that the people of Simonia had in their mind when they asked Levi to explain to them the passage in Daniel 10, 21, הרשום בכתב אמת, which seemed to them to be a contradiction in terms (p. l. c.). The explanation of this passage, which Levi afterwards gave to Judah I, רשום קודם גז"ר אמת לאחר גז"ר, corrects the opinion of the questioners, and assumes that the term רשום in Daniel 10, 21 has not the same meaning which it has in the technical term רשום, "allegorical sense." For it is characteristic of a sign or mark, רשום, that it is often made for temporary use only, liable to be changed, corrected, or rubbed off altogether. In this sense it is used in the passage in Daniel, to designate something marked or written down, which is yet doubtful and not meant to be final and permanent. And although even

both of which phrases mean: "If you take the scriptural passage in a true, literal sense, how can you say it is its allegorical sense? And if you take it in its allegorical sense, how can you at the same time describe it as its true, literal meaning?" (see below, pp. 328-29).

This theory about the *Dorshe Reshumot* is thus supported by the information we can derive from one source, from the etymological meaning of the words composing the name given to them. We have now to test the validity of this theory by consulting the other source of information, their sayings and interpretations. We shall quote, in the following, a complete list of all the sayings and interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, and in examining them we shall find that in all the method applied is the one mentioned above, and designated by the word *Reshumot*, namely, the method of explaining the words in a metaphorical sense, treating them as signs and symbols for certain ideas. We shall find that some of the interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot* are also found in the writings of Philo, which only confirms the theory that, like the latter, the *Dorshe Reshumot* were allegoristic interpreters of the Scriptures. The parallels in the writings of Philo will help us sometimes to a better understanding of the sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot*. For these sayings and

in this sense **רשום** forms a contrast to the term **אמת**, which means something "true and lasting," yet the difficulty can be explained away by referring each term to different conditions, namely, **רשום קודם גזר דין**, "Before the sentence has been finally given and approved," the punishment it recommends is only **רשום**, "marked down," with the possibility of being changed or blotted out, in case the sentence is not approved; **אמת לאחר גזר דין**, but "after the sentence has been approved and confirmed," it is **אמת**, written down as a positive, permanent, and lasting document, not subject to change or correction. Of course, in the sense which the word **רשום** has in the phrase **רשום קודם גזר דין אמת לאחר גזר דין**, it has nothing to do with **רשום**, **דרשי רשומות**, used in the name **רשומות**.

interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot* have not always been preserved in their original and complete form. Some of them were condensed or shortened, and of some of them only one part has been preserved in the talmudic-midrashic literature, while the other part, left out or purposely ignored by the talmudic teachers, is to be found in Philo's works.

As their method was developed gradually by the allegoristic interpreters, I shall quote their sayings in an order that will indicate its origin and its successive stages, how it was originally applied only to special class of scriptural passages, absolutely demanding an allegorical interpretation, how it was later on extended more and more beyond its original limits, till it came to be applied, rather excessively, to passages that could hardly bear an allegorical interpretation.

The oldest and most original saying preserved of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is probably the following one in Sifre, Deut., 49, ed. Friedmann, 85a, referring to the passage in Deut. 11, 22:

"To walk in all His ways and to cleave unto Him." דורשי רשומות אומרים רצונך שתכיר מי שאמר והיה העולם למור הנדה שמתוך כך אתה מכיר את הקב"ה ומדבק בדרכיו. The *Dorshe Reshumot* say, "If thou desirest to recognize Him who by His word created the world, learn to understand and interpret correctly what the Scripture says about Him, for in this way thou canst recognize the Holy One, blessed be He, and cleave unto, and follow, His ways."

From this saying we can learn the origin of the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, and what it was that caused them to interpret words as symbols. The passage in Deut. 11, 22 was difficult to understand, as the phrase "to cleave unto Him" could not be taken literally, for, as Sifre expresses it:

וכי היאך אפשר לו לאדם לעלות במרום ולהדבק בו “How is it possible for a human being to go up to God and cleave unto Him?”. As an answer to this question, the saying of the allegoristic interpreters is quoted: In order to recognize God one must learn to interpret the scriptural expressions about Him correctly,¹⁵ that is, take them as *רשומות* as figurative and allegorical expressions. In doing so, he learns to know God and realizes that the expression “to cleave unto Him” has but the meaning “to imitate Him” and “follow His ways.” The original motive of the *Dorshe Reshumot* was to explain away all attributes inconsistent with their idea of a spiritual God. They, therefore, interpreted all anthropomorphic expressions in the Scriptures not according to their literal meaning, but in a metaphorical sense. One of Philo’s rules of allegorical interpretation is “to give up the literal meaning of a scriptural passage, if it says or implies something about God which, according to our pure conception of Him, is not becoming.”¹⁶

We should not think, however, that the *Dorshe Reshumot* were influenced by Philo or other Alexandrian allegorists. They were Palestinian teachers, and they developed their method of allegorical interpretation independent of external influences. Their allegorical interpretation of anthropomorphic expressions about God was the

¹⁵ The term *הגדה* is used here in its original meaning, in the sense of *הגדת הכתוב*, what the Scripture really means to say, what it wants to indicate and teach, comp. Bacher, *l. c.*, 30 and 33. “To learn” *הגדה* means, therefore, to learn the right method of interpreting the Scripture, so as to be able to get the full meaning of the scriptural word, and what it wants to tell us.

¹⁶ Comp. Carl Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandrien als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*, Jena, 1875, 165-66, with many references to Philo’s writings where this rule is observed.

natural result of their strict and pure monotheism and of their conception of God as an incorporeal Being.¹⁷

Mekilta d. R. Simon b. Johai, ed. Hoffmann, 153a, 5: דורשי רשומות אומרים אלקים לא תקלל מלאכתך ודמעך לא תאחר שאם קללת דין תבואתך אתה מקלל. The *Dorshe Reshumot* say that the meaning of the two verses (Exod. 23, 27-28) is: If you curse [or despise] the judge, you will bring a curse upon your grain.

Preceding this saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, the Mekilta d. R. Simon (*ibid.*, 152) quotes one by R. Eliezer b. Jacob, which takes the word "Elohim" in its literal meaning, so that v. 27 forbids cursing or blaspheming God, ליתן אזהרה על ברכת השם. In the same way the verse is interpreted by R. Akiba, in Mekilta d. R. Ishmael (ed. Weiss, 102b). As a contrast to these literal interpretations of the verse, the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is quoted. They do not take the word "Elohim" in its literal meaning, to designate God, but they consider it as a רשום, a sign, designating the human judge who executes divine justice. The meaning of v. 27 is, accordingly, to forbid the cursing or reviling of a human judge. For it would be unbecoming in God to forbid man to curse or revile Him. It might imply that it could affect Him. They further saw in the proximity of the two verses, 27 and 28, an indication that there is a relation of cause and effect between the two actions forbidden by them. They mean: Do not curse the judge, that you may not bring curses upon your harvest.

That the allegoristic interpreters (*Dorshe Reshumot*) should apply this method of סמוכים, which derives special

¹⁷ Comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 19. We must bear this in mind, for it will help us to understand the development of the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot* and distinguish them from the *Dorshe Hamurot* (see below, p. 329).

meanings from the position of the verses near each other, is not at all strange. It is one of Philo's rules of allegorical interpretation, to consider the position of the verses and attach a special meaning to their juxtaposition (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 178-179).

The next step taken by the *Dorshe Reshumot* in developing their method was to extend its application to other passages the literal interpretation of which presented some difficulty¹⁸ and for this reason had to be abandoned, as the literal interpretation of the anthropomorphic expressions about God had to be abandoned because of the insurmountable difficulty they presented. This is shown in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* (b. Berakot 24a): דורשי רשומות אמרו והיו חייד תלואים לך מנגד. זה התולה תפיליו. The *Dorshe Reshumot*¹⁹ said that the verse in Deut. 28, 66, "And thy life shall hang (in doubt) before thee," applies to the man who lets his Tefillin hang; that is, who is suspended in doubt in regard to his beliefs and religious principles, symbolized by the Tefillin.

The literal meaning of this passage presents some difficulty, for how can life hang? "Thy life shall hang before thee" does not give good sense. The literal interpretation of this passage had, therefore, to be abandoned, and the word חייד, "thy life", is taken by the *Dorshe Reshumot* in a figurative sense, as a רשום, a symbolic sign, for the religious

¹⁸ It was one of the rules of Philo, that whenever the passage presents some difficulty, or does not yield good sense, the literal meaning is to be abandoned, and the allegorical adopted. Comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 166-167.

¹⁹ Some editions have here *Dorshe Hamurot* instead of *Dorshe Reshumot*, also Rashi, *ad locum*. But as was stated on p. 298, these names are often interchanged. The correct reading here is *Dorshe Reshumot*, as found in many editions, and confirmed by Asheri, in *Halakot Ketanot*, *Hilkot Tefillin*, 28, and by *Midrash Hagadol*, MS. Schechter, on Deut. 28, 66. In the last place, however, some copyist wrote above the word רשומות, the word חמורות, which he deemed correct.

doctrines that are the sources of the true life. Tefillin, in the phrase התולה תפליין, does not mean the phylacteries themselves, but that for which they stand as symbols. This saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is correctly explained by Judah Leon de Modena, in his *Haboneh*: התפילין רמזו על עיקרי האמונה שכתוב בהן מציאותו יתברך יחודו ויכלתו ובוה צריך שיהיה האדם נכון וקיים ישר ונאמן ולא מסופק ותלוי, "The Tefillin are symbols for the fundamental principles and dogmas of religion, for the written passages they contain deal with the belief in the existence of God, His unity, and His Omnipotence. In these beliefs a man must be firm and steadfast, upright and faithful, and not wavering and doubting."

The interpretation which the *Dorshe Reshumot* give to this passage in Deut. 28, 66, is the same as Philo's. In his treatise "On the Posterity of Cain," ch. viii, Philo says²⁰: "Thy life shall hang in doubt before thee,' for it is the nature of the foolish man who is always being tossed about in a manner contrary to right reason to be hostile to tranquility and rest, and not stand firmly or with a sure foundation on any doctrine whatever. Accordingly, he is full of different opinions at different times, and sometimes even in the same circumstances, without any new occurrence having arisen to affect them, he will be perfectly contrary to himself, now great, now little, now hostile, now friendly, and, in short, he will, so to say, be everything that is most inconsistent in a moment of time, and as the Lawgiver says: 'All his life shall hang in doubt before him,' having no firm footing, but being constantly tossed about by opposing circumstances which drag it different ways."

²⁰ All quotations from Philo's works are given in this article according to Young's English translation.

Evidently Philo and the *Dorshe Reshumot* agree, only the interpretation of the latter has not been preserved in its original, but rather in a condensed and shortened form. Considering that this is true, that the sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot* have not been transmitted to us in their original form, we may doubt whether the word Tefillin was used by them to designate the principles or doctrines of the religion. It is more probable that the *Dorshe Reshumot*, in their interpretation, used another, more explicit word, to designate religious doctrines or beliefs. The later rabbis, who often used their own terms in reproducing the interpretation or meaning given to certain passages by the *Dorshe Reshumot*, must have substituted here the term Tefillin, which to them symbolized the religious doctrines, for some other word used by the *Dorshe Reshumot* themselves.

In interpreting the word חַיִּיךָ, "thy life," to mean religion, which is the source of true life, the *Dorshe Reshumot* were supported by the fact that in many passages of the Scripture, as, for instance, Deut. 30, 15, 20, the word חַיִּים, "life," is obviously used as a figure of speech, to designate the law, or religion, as the source of life. It was one of the rules of allegorical interpretation given by Philo, that the literal interpretation of a word is to be abandoned when it becomes evident from the context that it is used merely in a figurative sense (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 168). The Palestinian allegorists, the *Dorshe Reshumot*, independently of Philo, followed the same rule, and they even made it the means of extending the application of their method. Thus, for instance, if in a given passage of the Scripture a word was obviously used, to judge from the context, in a figurative sense, to designate a thing not covered by its literal meaning, then the *Dorshe*

Reshumot would consider it an established fact that it can be used as a *רשום*, a figure, or sign, to designate the thing, and they would interpret it in the same figurative sense even in passages in which the context demanded or favored a literal interpretation.

Examples of such an extended application of their method are the following two sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot*:

Mekilta d.-R. Ishmael, Way. 1, ed. Weiss, 52*b*, and Mekilta d.R. Simeon, ed. Hoffmann, 72, and b. Baba Kamma 82*a*, with slight variations: *וילכו שלשת ימים במדבר ולא מצאו מים דורשי רשומות אמרו לא מצאו דברי תורה שנמשלו למים שנאמר* "היו כל צמא לכו למים" "And they went three days in the wilderness and found no water" (Exod. 15, 22). The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, They did not find the words of the law, or religious instruction, which are called water metaphorically,²¹ for thus it is said (Isa. 55, 1): "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the water."

Because in this passage in Isaiah the word "water" is evidently used as a figure of speech to designate the Divine word, the *Dorshe Reshumot* interpreted it, in a figurative sense, to designate symbolically the Divine law, even in the passage in Exodus, where its simple and literal meaning is patent. Philo is also in the habit of interpreting the word "water" in a figurative sense, to mean the Divine word, or wisdom. Thus, in his treatise, "On the Allegories of the Sacred Laws," II, ch. xxi, he interprets the passage in Deut. 8, 14, "Who brought thee forth water," to mean the

²¹ The word *נמשלו* here is derived from the term *משל* which means "allegorical interpretation" (see above p. 301 and comp. Bacher, 122); it means, therefore, "allegorically expressed," or "symbolically represented." By way of contrast to this allegorical interpretation is given the literal interpretation as *בשמועו*, Mekilta, *ibid.*

Divine word. Also in his treatise, "On Dreams, That They Are Sent from God," II, ch. xxxi, and *ibid.*, ch. xxxviii, he interprets the words of Ps. 65, 10, "the river of God full of water," to mean the Divine word full of wisdom.

Mekilta, Way., ed. Weiss, 53a; also Mekilta D. R. S., ed. Hoffmann, 73, on Exod. 15, 25:

ויוֹרָהוּ ד' עֵץ וַיִּשְׁלַךְ אֶל הַמַּיִם וַיִּמְתְּקוּ הַמַּיִם דּוֹרְשֵׁי רִשּׁוּמוֹת אָמְרוּ:
הִרְאָהוּ דְּבַרִי תוֹרָה שֶׁנִּמְשְׁלוּ לָעֵץ שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר עֵץ חַיִּים הִיא לְמַחְזִיקִים בָּהּ:
"And the Lord showed him a tree, and he cast it into the waters, and the waters were made sweet" (Exod. 15, 25). The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, He showed him the words of the Torah, which are designated as a tree in a figurative sense, as it is said (Prov. 3, 18): "She [the Torah, or Wisdom] is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her."

The *Dorshe Reshumot* took the word עֵץ, "tree", as a symbol, or sign, representing figuratively the Torah, because, in one passage of the Scripture, this word is obviously used as a figurative expression, to designate the Torah. Philo, "On the Posterity of Cain", ch. xlv, also interprets the sweetening branch thrown into the water as meaning "a medicine upon our soul causing it to love labor". Accordingly, he interprets "Marah", not as a real place where the waters were bitter, but as a certain state of mind. Also in the treatise "On the Migration of Abraham", ch. viii, Philo explains "tree" as meaning "virtue", and the waters as meaning "mind." It is evident that the *Dorshe Reshumot*, interpreting "tree" to mean the Law, must also have interpreted "Marah" in an allegorical sense, and not literally as a place of bitter waters, for bitter waters cannot be made sweet by words of the law. But the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* has been preserved in an incomplete form; it is shortened; it mentions only that the tree was not a real tree, and omits that the bitter waters were not real bitter waters.

The following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* has also come down to us in a condensed form. Sifre Numb. 160, ed. Friedmann, 162a:

דורשי רשומות אמרו ג' עדיות הכתובים בפרשה ושפטו העדה והצילו
העדה והשיבו אותו העדה ללמדך שדיני נפשות בשלשים:

The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, The word עדה "congregation" mentioned three times in this passage (Num. 35, 24-25): "The congregation shall judge, and the congregation shall deliver, and the congregation shall restore", is to teach you that criminal cases, in which the life of the defendant is in jeopardy, must be brought before a tribunal consisting of thirty judges.

The premise on which this saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is based is omitted here. They took the word עדה, "congregation," not in its literal meaning, as the community or the entire congregation, but in accordance with their method, they interpreted it as a sign standing for a group of ten persons. They applied here the same principle as in interpreting עץ, "tree," to mean "words of the law." Because in one passage of the Scripture (Numb. 14, 27), the word עדה, "congregation", is used to designate a group of ten,²² the *Dorshe Reshumot* took the word as a sign for

²² The phrase in Num. 14, 27, "this evil congregation," has been understood as referring to the spies, Joshua and Caleb excluded, hence it came to be used as a designation for a group of ten, for besides Joshua and Caleb there were only ten spies. See Mishnah Sanhedrin i. 6, and also Mishnah Abot iii. 7. It is noteworthy that this interpretation of the *Dorshe Reshumot* effected a practical decision that cases in which the life of the defendant is in jeopardy can only be decided by a body of thirty judges. This is an exception to the rule given by Weiss (*Middot Soferim* on Mekilta 53a), that the interpretation of the *Dorshe Reshumot* were not considered to be of the kind by means of which halakic laws are derived from the written law: ענין שם דורשי רשומות מורה שלא העמידו מין מדרשים אלה בגדר המדרשים אשר מהם הוציאו הלכות. See below p. 329, also note 32, the rule of R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili in regard to the method of משל, or allegoristic interpretation.

a group of ten even in other passages. And as in the passage Num. 35, 24-25, the word occurs three times, they derived from it that three such groups of ten, or thirty persons, are required to judge and decide a case in which the life of the defendant is in jeopardy.

A further step, extending the application of their method, was made by the *Dorshe Reshumot*, when they brought it to bear on passages and words the literal meaning of which afford no difficulty whatever, and which are in the Scripture not used in an allegorical sense anywhere. Thus, for instance, they would interpret proper names, not as names, but as signs or symbols for certain states of mind that may be indicated by the proper name. Of this kind is the following saying in Mekilta d. R. Simon, ed. Hoffmann, 82:

דורשי רשומות אומרים אין רפידים אלא רפיון ידים לפי שרפו ידיהם של ישראל מן התורה לפיכך בא עליהן שונא שאין השונא בא אלא על החטא ועל העבירה:²³

The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, Rephidim [mentioned in Exod. 17, 8 as the place where Amalek fought with Israel] means nothing else than "weakness of hands", because the Israelites relaxed in their keeping of the law, therefore came the enemy upon them, for the enemy comes only because of sin and transgression.

The passage does not mean, accordingly, "Amalek came and fought with Israel in Rephidim", but rather, "Amalek came and fought with Israel because of their neglect to keep the law." Preceding this saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* in the Mekilta, the interpretation given by R. Eliezer is mentioned. According to this רפידים is to be taken כמשמעו, literally, to designate a certain locality

²³ In Mekilta d. R. Ishmael, Amalek I, ed. Weiss, 61a, this saying is given in the name of *Aherim*, "Others"; see below note 31.

called Rephidim. In contrast to this literal interpretation follows the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, according to which Rephidim is a sign, or symbol, and signifies the Israelites' attitude toward the law.²⁴

This saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* throws light on the passage in the Mekilta d. R. Ishmael, from which Bacher sought to prove that רשום means, like סתום, "obscure," "indistinct." The passage is in Mekilta, Amalek I. It is quoted here according to Friedmann's edition:

ויבא עמלק וילחם עם ישראל ברפידים ר' יהושע ור' אלעזר בן חסמא אומר המקרא הזה רשום (ומפורש ע"י איוב שנאמר הינאה גומא בלא ביצה ישנא אחו בלי מים (איוב ח') וכי איפשר לגומא להתגדל בלא ביצה הישנא אחו בלי מים וכי איפשר לאחו בלי מים כך אי אפשר לישראל בלא תורה) ולפי שפירשו מדברי תורה לכן בא עליהם השונא שאין השונא בא אלא על החטא ועל העבירה:

The saying of R. Joshua refers to the word רפידים, as is seen in Friedmann's edition, where the full verse is quoted ויבא עמלק וילחם עם ישראל ברפידים. In Weiss' edition, 61a, the second half of the verse is omitted, and only the first half is quoted ויבא עמלק, as often happens in the Midrashim; the beginning of the verse is quoted, although the interpretation that follows is based on the last words of the verse. The reader is expected to know the other half of the verse and understand the interpretation given to it.

What R. Joshua's interpretation of the passage was, we can see from b. Sanhedrin 106b: מאי רפידים ר' אליעזר אומר:

²⁴ Such interpretations of proper names are often given by Philo. For instance: in "Allegories of the Sacred Laws," Book II, ch. xxii, "Jordan, being interpreted, means descent," derived from the word ירד, and in "Allegories," Book III, ch. iv, "In the land of Midian," "that is to say, being interpreted, in the judgment of the nature of things"; *ibid.*, ch. vi, Arami, "being interpreted, means high." In "That the Worse Is Accustomed to Be always Plotting against the Better," chapter iv, "The name Shechem, being interpreted, means shoulder, the symbol of endurance," and chapter vi, "the name Hebron, when interpreted, means conjoined and associated."

רפידים שמה ר' יהושע אומר שריפו עצמם מדברי תורה. What is Rephidim? R. Eliezer says, a place called Rephidim. R. Joshua says it means that they became negligent in the observance of the law.

We see that R. Joshua gives the same interpretation as the *Dorshe Reshumot* gave, as mentioned in Mek. d. R. Simon. In Mekilta R. Ishm., R. Joshua gives the same interpretation, only he characterizes it as an allegoristic interpretation, in opposition to the literal interpretation, which takes Rephidim as a name.

R. Joshua's saying read originally thus:

המקרא הזה רשום לפי שפירשו מדברי תורה לכך בא עליהם השונא שאין השונא בא אלא על החטא ועל העבירה:

This passage, "Amalek fought with Israel in Rephidim," is to be interpreted in the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*; Rephidim is a figurative expression, a רשום. Because the Israelites departed from the law, the enemy came upon them, for the enemy only comes because of sin and transgression. The rest of the words, from ומפורש till בלא תורה, which I have put in parenthesis, are a later addition, seeking to illustrate, with the help of the passage in Job, how necessary the law is for the existence and welfare of Israel.

The interpretation of proper names as signs or symbols is also given in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, b. Sanhedrin 104b-105a, also in p. x. 2, near the end:

דורשי רשומות היו אומרים כולם באין לעו"ה שנאמר לי גלעד זה אחאב שנפל ברמות גלעד, מנשה כמישמעו, אפרים מעון ראשי זה ירבעם דקאתי מאפרים, יהודה מחוקקי זה אחיתופל דקאתי מיהודה, מואב סיר רחצי זה ניחוי שלקה על עיסקי רחיצה, על אדום אשליך נעלי זה דואג האדומי:

The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, All of them [referring to Ahab, Jeroboam, Manasseh, Ahithophel, Doeg, and Gehazi, who

are mentioned in the Mishnah as excluded from the world to come] will have a share in the future world, for it is said (Ps. 60, 9-10), "Gilead is Mine", Gilead stands here for King Ahab, who died in Ramoth Gilead. "And Manasseh is Mine", Manasseh is to be taken literally, not as referring to the tribe, but to King Manasseh. "Ephraim is the strength of My head"; Ephraim here means Jeroboam, who was an Ephraimite. "Judah is My lawgiver"; Judah stands here for Ahithophel, who came from the tribe of Judah. "Moab is My washpot"; this alludes to Gehazi, whose punishment had some connection with bathing or washing [he was punished for taking something from Naaman, who bathed in the Jordan, and became healed]. "Over Edom I will cast out My shoe"; Edom here designates Doeg the Edomite. The words are spoken by God, and they thus indicate that all the persons alluded to will become reconciled to God and come to Him in the other world.

The words in the two verses, 9-10 of Ps. 60, are taken out of their connection and away from their literal meaning. They are interpreted as signs or symbols alluding to certain persons, since they can be taken remotely as reminders of an event or an accident in their lives. This method was applied by the allegoristic *Dorshe Reshumot* as well as by Philo, who gives as a rule for allegorical interpretation, that a word may be explained independently of the sense clearly indicated by the connection in which it stands with the other words in the sentence (compare Siegfried, *l. c.*, 170-171).

The same disregard for the literal meaning of words and the context in which they are found is also to be seen in the following interpretation of the *Dorshe Reshumot*: Midrash Hagadol, ed. Schechter, 391, on Gen. 25, 22:

דבר אחר אם בן למה זה אנכי דורשי רשומות אומרין אמרה רבקה לפני הק"ב רב"שע אם בן עתיד עשו להרוג ולכלות אדירי חכמה שהן עתידין להיות מבניו של יעקב מי יאמר לפניך על הים זה אלי ואנוהו ולמי תאמר על הר סיני אנכי ד' אלקיך מיד חגרה מתניה ועמדה בתפלה: Another explanation of the passage Gen. 25, 22, "If it be so, why am I thus?" is the one given by the *Dorshe Reshumot*, who said: Rebekah said before the Holy One, blessed be He, Lord of the universe, if this be so, if Esau is bound to kill and destroy the mighty men of wisdom²⁵ that are to come from the children of Jacob, who will say before you at the Red Sea, "He is my God, and I will prepare Him a habitation" (Exod. 15, 2), and to whom wilt Thou say on Sinai: "I am the Lord thy God" (Exod. 20, 2)?

The meaning of this saying is, What will become of the relation between God and Israel expressed by these two sentences? The word זה stands as a sign for the whole sentence in Exod. 15, 2, beginning with this word, and אנכי is a sign or symbol for the first sentence of the decalogue, the first word of which is אנכי, "I am." As has already been said above, the first letter of a word and the first word of a sentence can be used as a sign for the word, and the sentence, respectively.

This method of taking a word as a sign to remind one of a sentence beginning with the word is applied in the following interpretation of the *Dorshe Reshumot* in the Midrash Hagadol, ed. Schechter, 769, on Gen. 50, 24; ויאמר יוסף אל אחיו אנכי מת ואלקים פקוד אתכם דורשי רשומות אומרין מסורת היו בידיהן שמי שבא ואמר להן פקוד פקדתי אתכם הוא ינאל אתכם:

²⁵ That the *Dorshe Reshumot* consider the mighty men of wisdom to come from Jacob, reminds one of Philo's designating Jacob as "being mind" in *Allegories*, Book III, ch. vi, and "full of wisdom," *ibid.*, ch. i., and as "the practiser of knowledge," in the treatise "That the Worse is Accustomed to Be always Plotting against the Better," ch. ii.

"The *Dorshe Reshumot* said that there was a tradition among the Israelites in Egypt that the one who will come and speak the words beginning with פקוד (Exod. 31, 16) is the true redeemer, and he will deliver them." Here the word פקוד is not taken as the infinitive preceding the verb יפקוד to mean: "God will surely visit you." The word פקוד is rather interpreted as a sign for the phrase in Exod. 31, 16, used by Moses, which also begins with פקוד, and it characterizes the true redeemer, who will use this phrase on his appearance. The following verb, יפקוד, is the predicate. The one who will use the phrase פקוד, "will visit you" and bring you out of this land. It was a rule of allegorical interpretation applied by Philo to derive a special meaning from a word seemingly superfluous. The infinitive preceding a verb was considered by Philo a superfluous word of this sort (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 168-169). The *Dorshe Reshumot* followed the same rule, and therefore they sought to get a special meaning out of the infinitive פקוד preceding the verb יפקוד in Gen. 50, 24.

The same disregard for the literal meaning of the words and of the context in which they are found appears in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, in the *Mekilta d. R. S. b. J.*, ed. Hoffmann, 117-118:

כי תקנה עבד עברי והלא לא היה לו לסמוך לאלה המשפטים אלא כי יריבון כי ינצו.. וכי יכה איש שהן דינין דורשי רשומות אומרין לפי שנצטוו במרה על הדינין ונתן להן עשרת הדברות אמר משה רב"ש שמה יתעה יצר הרע את בניך ויעברו על המצוות ותגלה אותן מלפניך ותמכרם לעבדים לכך פתח כי תקנה עבד עברי כשתקניאם למלכיות אל ישתעבדו בהן יותר משש מלכיות שש שנים יעבוד בבל ומדי ופרס ויון ואשור ורומי ובשביעית יצא לחפשי חנם אמר לפניו רב"ש שמה אל ישתקעו ביד רומי אלא זכות עשה עמהם חנם ובשביעית יצא לחפשי חנם. אם בגפו יבא היה למקרא לומר אם לבדו יבא לבדו יצא מהו בגפו אמר חס ושלום אם נרמו עוונות אויבים באים אליהם באנפים כנשרים שטטים בשמים דכתיב

(איכה ד' יט) קלים היו רודפינו כנשרי שמים רב"שע כנפים של בטחונות תן להם מי אלה בעב תעופינה וכיונים אל ארובותיהם (ישעיה ס' ח):
 Close upon the introductory sentence: "These are the judgments which thou shalt set before them," (Exod. 21, 1), the laws in verses 18, 22, 26, which are, properly speaking, judgments and civil laws, should have followed. The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, "Because the Israelites were commanded in Marah in regard to judgments and civil laws, and He gave them the Ten Commandments, Moses said, 'Lord of the Universe, the evil inclination may cause Thy children to go astray, so that they will transgress the commandments, and Thou wilt banish them from before Thee and sell them as slaves.'" For this reason he (Moses) began with the following verse (2), "If thou buy a Hebrew servant," that means, if thou causest the Hebrew (people) to be acquired as slaves by the kingdoms of the earth, let not more than six kingdoms oppress them, namely, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Greece, Syria,²⁶ and Rome. This is the meaning of the words, "six years shall he serve." Moses further said: "Lord of the universe, let them not remain forever in the hands of Rome, show them Thy mercy, though they do not deserve it, and let them become free." This is the meaning of the words, "and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." The Scripture could have used the word לברו, "alone," in the phrase, "if he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself". Why is the word בנפו (meaning, also "with his wing") used? Moses said: "May it never come about, but if it should happen that, as a result of their sins, their enemies descend upon them as with wings, as the eagles that fly near heaven—for it is said (Lam. 4, 19): 'Our

²⁶ אשור stands here for Syria, not for Assyria.

persecutors are swifter than the eagles of heaven'—then, O Lord of the universe, give Thou them safe and reliable wings, with which the persecuted dove may fly home," as alluded to in Isa. 60, 8.

We see here again that the *Dorshe Reshumot* applied the rule of סמוכים (see above), and in the position of the two verses 1 and 2 near each other, they saw a relation of cause and effect indicated. The words are spoken by Moses and addressed to God: After Thou hast given them Thy laws, the transgression of which may bring them into slavery, deal mercifully with them. The six years are symbolical expressions for the six kingdoms that successively oppressed Israel. The word עברי "Hebrew" is not adjective to עבר, "servant," but stands for the Hebrew people. The word בנפו, which can also mean "with his wing," is a symbolical expression for the swift enemy as well as for the wing with which Israel, the gentle dove, will save herself. This interpretation of the word בנפו the *Dorshe Reshumot* derived from the fact that the Scripture does not use here the synonymous expression לברו, "alone," which has no other meaning. In using the word בנפו, which means "alone," but has also the meaning "with his wing," the Scripture conveys the idea that we can interpret it according to its second meaning. This method is observed also by their fellow allegorist, Philo, one of whose rules for allegorical interpretation was, that special consideration is to be given to the difference between synonymous expressions, and if in a particular passage a particular synonym is used, the Scripture meant to indicate a special meaning contained in it and not in its synonyms (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 171 ff).

The allegoristic *Dorshe Reshumot* followed another rule of allegorical interpretation often used by Philo,

namely, to seek to exhaust all possible meanings of a word, and thus gain a new sense from the scriptural passage (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 174-175). Accordingly, they would interpret a word as a רשום, sign or symbol, suggesting some idea, if one of several possible meanings of the word could, if but remotely, indicate or recall the idea. This is seen in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* quoted by R. Akiba, in Midrash Kohelet Rabba, x. 1:

דרש ר"ע לבן הרחיבה שאל נפשה ופערה פיה לבלי חק חקים אין כתיב כאן אלא לבלי חק מי שאין לו מצוה שתכריע על זכותיו. דורשי רשומות אומרים האדם נידון אחר רובו ולעולם ימור אדם עצמו חציו זכאי וחציו חייב עשה מצוה אחת אשריו שהכריע את עצמו לכף זכות עבר עבירה אחת אוי לו שהכריע את עצמו לכף חובה:

R. Akiba said in a discourse, The passage in Isa. 5, 14, "Therefore hell has enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure," means hell opened her mouth for the one who possesses no virtuous action that will cause his merits to overbalance his shortcomings, for the *Dorshe Reshumot* said, A man is judged according to the majority of his actions, and a man must always consider himself as having as many merits as faults, or as many good actions as bad ones to his credit, so that when he does one good deed, happy he, for he has thereby caused the scale holding his merits to sink, and when he has committed one sin, woe to him, because he has caused the scale of his guilt to decline.

The *Dorshe Reshumot*, whom R. Akiba mentions here, are his authority for this interpretation of the passage in Isaiah. For the *Dorshe Reshumot* were not merely intent upon giving a general rule for a man's estimate of himself and his actions; they were interpreters of the Scripture. Their saying here is evidently based upon their peculiar

interpretation²⁷ of the words **לְבִי חָק**, which can also mean "without law," or "without the fulfilment of a law." They, therefore, took the words not as the adverbial clause "without measure," but as a **רְשום**, a sign, representing the man for whom hell opens her mouth as the one who falls short by one in the observance of the commandments. Hence they derived their saying that one good or bad action can decide a man's standing and his fate.

The same rule, of seeking another meaning to a word, in order to derive the allegorical sense of the passage, is observed in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* (Mekilta d. R. Ishm., Way. IV, ed. Weiss, 58a, on Exod. 16, 21):

וילקטו אותו בבקר בבקר בשחרית בשחרית דורשי רשומות אמרו מכאן שהיה במן בועת אפך תאכל לחם:

"And they gathered it every morning." The words **בבוקר בבוקר** mean literally **בשחרית בשחרית**, "every morning." The *Dorshe Reshumot*, however, said that we learn from this passage, that the curse, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" (Gen. 3, 19) applied even to the manna; also that was eaten in the sweat of the brow.

It is not reported how the *Dorshe Reshumot* derived their statement from this passage, but we can guess at their method. From the preceding interpretation of the words **בבוקר בבוקר** as meaning "every morning," in contrast to which the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is adduced, we can learn, that the *Dorshe Reshumot* did not interpret the words **בבוקר בבוקר** according to their literal

²⁷ Although the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is quoted as an independent saying, it is based upon the passage from Isaiah mentioned by R. Akiba. Only the Midrash did not care to quote the passage again, after having quoted it at the beginning of the paragraph. Similarly, in Sifre, Deut. 49, the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is apparently quoted as an independent saying, though it is based upon and interprets the scriptural phrase **וְלִדְבָקָה בּוֹ** quoted in the beginning of the paragraph; see above p. 304.

meaning. They did not take them to mean "morning," they attributed some other meaning to them. Now the word **בקר** can also mean "search," "seek," (Lev. 13, 36; 27, 33). According to their method of letting the sense of a passage depend upon their preferred meaning of a word selected from several possible meanings (see above) they here interpreted the word **בבוקר** to mean not "in the morning," but "with seeking, with diligent search," and they deduced from it, that even the manna was eaten in the sweat of the brow, since the people had to exert themselves in seeking it; and they succeeded in gathering it only after diligent, toilsome search.²⁸ In *Mekilta d. R. S. b. J.*, ed. Hoffmann, 78, this saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is mentioned as being based on the second half of the verse, **אִישׁ כַּפִּי אָכְלוּ**, "every man according to his eating."

According to this version, the *Dorshe Reshumot* followed another rule of allegoristic interpretation often applied by Philo, though originally Palestinian (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 170), namely, the rule whereby an indication of a deeper meaning, a hint of some idea, is discovered in the repetition of things known, or said before. Accordingly, the *Dorshe Reshumot* interpreted the words **אִישׁ כַּפִּי אָכְלוּ**, verse 21, not to mean "as much as one could eat," for this was said in verse 18, "they gathered every man according to his eating." The repetition of the words in verse 21 must indicate something else, they are a **רשום** signifying the manner in which the manna was eaten,

²⁸ It may be that the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is based upon the words **אִישׁ כַּפִּי אָכְלוּ**, as appears from the *Mekilta d. R. S.* But in the *Mekilta d. R. Ishmael* the second half of the verse is not quoted, though the interpretation is based on it; as often happens in the Midrash, only the first part of a verse is quoted, even if the interpretation refers to the last half of it (see above p. 314).

namely, "man according to his eating," as man can eat, and men, the children of Adam, according to the curse decreed upon them, can eat only in the sweat of their brow, and the manna was no exception to the rule, Manna also was eaten in the way bread is eaten by man, namely, in the sweat of his brow.

It is probable that the same rule, of interpreting a word according to one of its possible meanings, and thus making it suggest some idea, was applied in the following saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, although its application is not so clearly visible as in the other two sayings. Mekilta, Way. III, ed. Weiss, 57b, on Exod. 16, 15:

ויראו בני ישראל ויאמרו איש אל אחיו מן הוא כי לא ידעו מה הוא כאדם שאומר לחבירו מה הוא כך אמרו זה לזה (מכילתא דרש"בי, כך אמרו ישראל מן הוא) דורשי רשומות אמרו ישראל קראוהו מן:

"And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, what is it? for they knew not what it was." Just as a man says to his fellow-man, "What is it?", so they said one to another (according to Mekilta d. R. S. b. J.: So the Israelites said "What is it?"). The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, "The Israelites called it manna."

Here, as in many other places, the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is quoted as a contrast to the preceding literal interpretation of the Scriptural passage. According to the latter, the word מן means nothing else than מה "what," and the phrase, "they said one to another, 'It is manna,'" simply means, they asked each other what it was. According to the *Dorshe Reshumot*, however, the words do not express a question at all, they express a positive statement. The phrase, "They said one to another, מן הוא," means they declared it was to be called "manna," that is, they called it by that name. But this name cannot, according to the *Dorshe Reshumot*, mean "food," מן be-

ing like מִזֶּן (comp. Succah 39 *b*), as Weiss in *Middot Soferim* interprets it, nor can it mean "something prepared," מִן = וּמִן Jonah 4, 6, as Wünsche in his German translation of the Mekilta understands it. The *Dorshe Reshumot*, being allegorists, must have given the name "manna" some allegorical or symbolical meaning, not the simple literal meaning, as "food," or "something prepared."

This is especially evident from the passage in Mekilta Way. V, ed Weiss, 59a, where the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is repeated as interpreting Exod. 16, 31:

וּקְרָאוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת שְׁמוֹ מִן דּוֹרְשֵׁי רִשּׁוּמוֹת אָמְרוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל קְרָאוּ אֶת שְׁמוֹ מִן:

"And the house of Israel called the name thereof manna." The *Dorshe Reshumot* said, "The house of Israel called its name manna."

Here the *Dorshe Reshumot* apparently do not add anything to what is said in the text, and one cannot see what interpretation they meant to give to the passage in verse 31 by repeating it almost in the same words.²⁹ It is, therefore, evident that the *Dorshe Reshumot* interpreted

²⁹ This difficulty was felt by R. Tobiah b. Eliezer, and in his Midrash *Lekah Tob*, ed. Buber, 57, he tries to explain it by remarking, after quoting the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*: אָבֵל עַד שֶׁבָּאוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּקְרָאוּ שְׁמוֹ. "But before the children of Israel came and called its name 'manna' it was not called manna, but 'food of the mighty,' or 'angels' food,'" according to Ps. 78, 25. A similar explanation is given by Wünsche in his German translation of the Mekilta. He remarks: *Der eigentliche Name ist nach Ps. 78, 24, דָּגֵן שָׁמַיִם, Korn des Himmels.*" Comp. also Friedmann in *Meir Ayin* on Mekilta 51a.

But these explanations do not explain the difficulty. For if the *Dorshe Reshumot* meant to say that "manna" was merely the name used by the children of Israel, and not the original or real name of the heavenly food, they ought to have said that there was another name for it, and not merely repeat the words of the text, "The house of Israel called its name 'manna.'" Besides, one would think that the name given to it by the Israelites, who first saw it and first named it, should be its original and correct name.

the word מן in an allegorical sense, not according to its literal meaning. In their saying, "The children of Israel, or the house of Israel, called it manna," the word manna is used in a symbolical sense, and thus their interpretation of the scriptural passage is conveyed to us. What this allegorical meaning of the word "manna" was according to the *Dorshe Reshumot* cannot be learned with certainty from their saying itself, which, like most of their sayings, has not been preserved in its original form. It is probably quoted incompletely in the Mekilta. We can, however, guess at what this meaning was, when we consider how their fellow-allegorist Philo interpreted the word. According to Philo, manna is "the word of God, all nourishing wisdom" (On Seeking Instruction, ch. xl). In another passage Philo says: "Moses calls manna the most ancient word of God, by which appellation is understood something of the most general nature" (That the Worse Is Accustomed to be Plotting against the Better, ch. xxxi). Again, in the third book of the treatise on the Allegories of the Sacred Laws (ch. li), when he interprets the passage in Deut. 8, 3, "and He gave you manna to eat," Philo says: "And the proof of this is that He nourishes us with His own word, which is most universal of all things, for manna, being interpreted, means "what," and "what" is the most universal of all the things: for the word of God is over all the world, and is the most ancient and the most universal of all the things that are created."

It is probable that the allegoristic *Dorshe Reshumot* interpreted the word מן as a רשום, symbol, signifying "the word of God," or "spiritual food." In contrast to the literal interpretation of the words מן הוא, expressing a question, "what is it?" the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot* is quoted as interpreting it in an allegorical way, mean-

ing "that universal thing," "the word of God," all-nourishing wisdom. The idea of seeing in the manna merely spiritual food finds its echo in many utterances of the Palestinian teachers. Thus the saying of R. Akiba, Yoma 75*a*, based upon an interpretation of Ps. 78, 25, that the manna was the bread which the angels ate probably had the meaning, that manna was but spiritual food.³⁰ The same idea is reflected in other interpretations, as, for instance, of the passage Exod. 16, 31, where it is said that the manna was white, which is taken by the Talmud to mean that the manna caused the sins of Israel to become white, that is, freed Israel from their sins, מלבין עונותיהם של ישראל (Yoma 75), and again, in the interpretation of the words דומה לאגדה שהוא, Exod. 17, 31, as meaning מושך לבו של אדם, "The manna was like the words of the haggadah, which attract the heart of man" (Mekilta Way., ed. Weiss, 59*b*). In Yoma 75, this interpretation is given in the name of Aherim, "others," which may have

³⁰R. Ishmael's remark, that "R. Akiba made a mistake, for angels eat no bread" (Yoma 75), was not justified, since R. Akiba knew well that angels eat no bread. But his saying referred to spiritual food, or wisdom. As this idea, of identifying the manna with wisdom or the word of God, implied the denial of the actual story of the Scripture about the miracle of the manna, it was not popular among the rabbis, and sayings expressing this idea were either altogether suppressed or at least modified and not fully quoted. Thus, for instance, the saying that like the prophet the manna told the Israelites all their secrets (Mekilta, Waj. V, and Yoma 75), may have meant originally that the word of God reveals the truth, and was modified later on to mean, that by the number of the portions of manna, which miraculously came to each household in a measure corresponding to the number of persons belonging to it, certain secrets about the illegitimacy of children were revealed, and certain disputes about the ownership of slaves were settled. It is probably due to the same considerations, in order not to deny the actuality of the miraculous food, that the saying of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, interpreting it allegorically, has been preserved only in a shorter form.

been applied to the anonymous allegoristic interpreters, the *Dorshe Reshumot*.³¹

We have seen from all the interpretations that have been preserved to us, that the *Dorshe Reshumot* interpreted the Scriptures in an allegorical way, taking the words not in their literal meaning, but as signs and symbols. Their interpretations are, accordingly, quoted by way of contrast with the simple and literal interpretations, כשמועו. We have also seen that these interpreters of the Scriptures were Palestinian teachers, and independent of outside influences, their methods being the product of the inner development of the Palestinian exegesis. For although we have seen that many of their interpretations are given also by Philo, and that the rules for interpretation followed by them are the same that were applied by Philo, we must not assume that the *Dorshe Reshumot* were influenced by the Alexandrian allegorists. Rather the contrary is true, that Philo was influenced by the Palestinian allegoristic interpreters of the Scriptures (comp. Schürer, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III,⁴ 701 ff), as his rules of allegorical interpretation were composed of the rules applied by the Palestinian teachers as well as the rules applied by the Stoic philosophers (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 165). In the *Dorshe Reshumot* we recognize therefore, the oldest Palestinian allegoristic interpreters of the Scriptures. As their methods were purely Palestinian, their interpretations according to these methods, being Palestinian products, were generally known and acceptable to the teachers of the law.

³¹ The interpretation to the word רפירים given by the *Dorshe Reshumot* in Mekilta d. R. Simeon (see above p. 313) is ascribed in Mekilta d. R. Ishmael, Amalek I, ed. Weiss, 61a, to the *Aherim*, from which we can see that the name *Aherim*, "Others," has sometimes been applied to the *Dorshe Reshumot*.

This explains why more sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot* have been preserved than of the other class of allegorists, the *Dorshe Hamurot*, whose method and tendency, as we shall see, were not of Palestinian origin. In the course of time, however, the rabbis became apprehensive of the grave dangers that threatened Judaism from the allegoristic interpretation, according to the method of רשום, or, as it is also called, משל, "allegory." For, if the words of the Scripture are taken merely as an allegorical expression, משל, or symbolical signs, רשום, and not in their literal meaning, no religious law need be observed, since the words expressing it may be interpreted to us in an allegorical way, to mean something else than the command to do according to its literal meaning. It was, therefore, strictly forbidden to apply this method of the allegorists in interpreting scriptural passages which contain laws and commandments.³² R. Ishmael being the only one among the teachers who permitted himself to interpret three passages of the law in an allegoristic manner, במין משל (Sifre Deut. 237, ed. Friedmann, 117 b; Mekilta Mishpatim, VI, ed. Weiss, 88b), taking certain words occurring in these passages not literally, but merely in a figurative sense. But the rabbis objected even to an allegoristic interpretation of

³² In the Baraita of the Thirty-two Rules of Haggadic Interpretation, by R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili, the method of משל, of taking the words in an allegorical or parabolical sense is mentioned (rule 26), and it is added: במה דברים אמורים בדברי קבלה אבל בדברי תורה ומצוה אי אתה יכול לדורשן בלשון משל חוץ משלשה דברים שהיה ר' ישמעל דורשן בלשון משל. "This method can only be used in interpreting passages of the Scriptures which do not express laws, but in those passages of the Scripture that contain laws and commandments you cannot interpret the words in a figurative and allegorical sense, excepting the three passages which R. Ishmael has interpreted in the allegoristic method." The rule as well as the limitation of its use to the portions of the Scriptures not containing laws, is older than R. Eliezer, the son of R. Jose the Galilean, who merely collected these old rules and compiled them in his Baraita.

these portions of the Scripture, which did not contain laws. They feared that such an interpretation might lead to a denial of the historic facts narrated in the Bible, and especially to a disbelief in the miracles. As we have seen, according to the interpretation of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, there was no miraculous food, "manna," there was no real place Marah, in which the water was bitter, and was made sweet in a miraculous way through a certain tree. And there was no place called Rephidim, in which the Israelites engaged in battle with Amalek, and the Israelites were never wanting in real water in the wilderness. Added to the apprehensions of the rabbis was the danger of the allegoristic method's becoming a weapon against Judaism in the hands of the followers of the new religion, who would use it to prove from the Scripture the superiority of their new faith." The rabbis, therefore, objected to the application of this method in interpreting the Scriptures, and they rejected as absolutely false most of the interpreta-

²³ Paul often used the allegoristic method applied by the *Dorshe Reshumot*. Thus in Hebrews 7, 2, he takes the names Melchizedek and Salem, Gen. 14, 18, not as proper names, but according to the meaning which these names could have, interpreting them to mean King of Righteousness and King of Peace, *שלם* being interpreted like *שלום*, in the same manner as the *Dorshe Reshumot* and Philo interpreted proper names according to the meaning of the words (see above n. 24). In I Corinthians 10, 1-3, he designates the meat which the Israelites ate in the wilderness, and the drink which they drank, as "spiritual," which reminds one of the interpretation of Philo and the *Dorshe Reshumot*, that "water" represents the "law," and "manna," the word of God (see above pp. 310 and 326 ff.), and not, as Meyer in his commentary explains, that they were designated as spiritual, as having been supplied supernaturally. In Galatians 5, 22-31, he seeks to prove the abolition of the law and rejection of the covenant on Sinai by allegorizing the story of Abraham's two sons Ishmael and Isaac from Hagar and Sarah, respectively, taking Hagar as a sign representing the covenant on Sinai, and Sarah, who in Gen. 11, 30, is called *עקרה*, "a barren woman," to represent Jerusalem, which, in Isaiah 54, is parabolically called a barren woman, and thus symbolizes the covenant of Jerusalem.

tions of the allegorists, as well as the scriptural proofs which the followers of the new religion brought by means of such allegoristic interpretations. They could not, however, reject the whole method as such, since in certain passages of the Scripture its application is justified and necessary, and, as one rabbi said: *אלֹהֵי הַמִּשָּׁל הַזֶּה קָל בְּעֵינֶיךָ שֶׁעַל יְדֵי הַמִּשָּׁל אֲדָם עֹמֵד עַל דְּבָרֵי תוֹרָה*, "Let not the allegoristic method appear to you as slight, for by means of the allegoristic method one may sometimes get at the true meaning of the scriptural words" (Cant. R. I, 8).

They could not scorn the whole method as being false, but they could and did scorn the wild and exaggerated use made of it by a certain class of thinkers. The rabbis, therefore, declared that most of these allegoristic interpretations do not give the true and real sense of the scriptural passage. This is to be found in the interpretation according to the simple and literal meaning of the words. Thus the terms *רשום*, "symbolical meaning," and *משל*, "allegorical meaning," came to be considered as antonyms to *אמת*, "true and literal meaning" (see above). Even when, for the purpose of deriving an ethical lesson, the scriptural passage may be interpreted in an allegorical way, the rabbis made it a rule that *אין מקרא יוצא מִדִּי פְשׁוּטוֹ*, that its plain and literal meaning may never be ignored or denied.³⁴ This principle, intended, as it was, as a protest against the allegoristic method, had also, strange as it may appear, the effect of saving the method itself and in a measure approving it. Since it was declared that the literal meaning remains always the true and correct meaning of the Scriptures, that it cannot be explained away by

³⁴ Yebamot 11b, 24a, and Shabbat 63a. Although first mentioned by Judah b. Ezekiel, the rule is much older than his time and is of Palestinian origin.

any allegoristic interpretation, the rabbis felt assured that no harm could come to Judaism if this method was used carefully and moderately in homiletic discourses, for the purpose of deriving moral lessons from the Scriptures, always keeping in mind and making it understood that such interpretations are not to be taken seriously, as the real meaning of the scriptural word.³⁵ This changed attitude of the rabbis toward the allegoristic method weakened, in a measure, the resentment felt by them toward the ancient allegorists. It caused a reaction against the prevalent tendency, which was to ignore them, let them fall into oblivion, and suppress their sayings altogether. The rabbis were now less afraid of mentioning their names occasionally and quoting some of their less harmful sayings. Thus it came about that a few of the interpretations of the ancient allegorists have been preserved in the Palestinian as well as in the Babylonian Talmud, and in the Midrashim, originating in both countries. But even these few interpretations the rabbis did not preserve complete; they often shortened or modified them, to make them less objectionable and less harmful, and, as we have seen, in most cases the rabbis were careful to give, side by side with these interpretations, also the literal interpretation, *בשמועו*, as the true and real meaning of the passage. The majority of the interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, however, have been lost to us, the rabbis objecting to them and not caring to preserve them.³⁶

³⁵ Accordingly, we find in the Talmud many interpretations in the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*; a word is taken as symbolizing or representing something not contained in its literal meaning.

³⁶ Eisenstein's theory (*Ozar Israel*, IV, s. v. *דורשי רשומות*), that the interpretations of the *Dorshe Reshumot* were collected and arranged in a special Midrash, called "The Midrash of the *Dorshe Reshumot*," subsequently lost, is absolutely without foundation. As we have seen, there

was a tendency among the rabbis to suppress these interpretations, and they did not care to preserve them. There never was such a Midrash of the *Dorshe Reshumot*. The words **מדרש דורשי רשומות**, occurring in Baḥya's Commentary on the Pentateuch (see **יתרו**, in Warsaw edition, p. 71b) and in Ṭur, *Orah Hayyim*, 118, do not refer to a Midrash of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, but to the interpretations (**מדרש**) of some kabbalistic teachers, who interpreted the letters of the alphabet as signs and according to their value as numbers (comp. Buber, *Yeriot Shelomoh*, 17). In Ṭur, *Orah Hayyim*, 113, it is expressly said, in the name of R. Jehiel, **דורשי רשומות הם חסידיו אשכנז**, "the *Dorshe Reshumot* are the pious men of Germany." We see here plainly that the mediæval rabbis used the name *Dorshe Reshumot* to designate certain mediæval teachers. The name thus used by them has nothing to do with the ancient allegorists of that name who are mentioned in the Talmud. Eisenstein probably followed the *Rab Pe'alim* by R. Abraham b. Elijah of Wilna, where it is said on pp. 46-47, that there was a "Midrash *Dorshe Reshumot*" quoted by Jacob Asheri and Baḥya. But this passage in *Rab Pe'alim* is not from R. Abraham b. Elijah. It has been put in by some copyist from a marginal note by an unknown and doubtful author (see Chones, note to Buber's *Yeriot Shelomoh*, 16-17).

(To be concluded)

THE ARYAN WORDS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By W. ST. CLAIR TISDALE, Bedford, Beds, England

I.

ALL Hebrew scholars are aware that in the Hebrew and Aramaic Masoretic text of the Old Testament there are a number of words which have for ages puzzled translators, commentators, and lexicographers. In some instances the meaning of such words had been lost before the Septuagint version was made, and consequently the authors of that translation had either to content themselves with transliterating the original vocables or to make a more or less accurate guess at their signification. Somewhat of the same system was adopted in later versions. Ancient and Medieval Jewish commentators, even the greatest of them, often show, by their vain attempts to discover a Semitic etymology for such words, how difficult they found the matter. Even when we turn to the Hebrew Lexicon of Drs. Brown, Driver, and Briggs, the very latest effort of Hebrew-Aramaic scholarship in that direction, we find that, vast as is the fund of erudition to be discovered in that volume, yet many of these problems are there admitted to be still unsolved.

It may seem rash to make another attempt when so many have failed. Yet it is evident that the matter is of such great interest and importance that it ought not to be left in its present unsatisfactory condition. Even a partial solution of the problem, leaving aside for the present

all Egyptian, Accadian, and Assyro-Babylonian words, and dealing merely with those which are now supposed to be of Āryan origin, may not be altogether devoid of value. If we succeed in discovering the correct etymology of such words, this may be valuable as throwing light upon questions of the date, authenticity, and authorship of the books in which they occur. At present, however, we leave all this aside and confine ourselves to a strictly philological investigation in the Articles on the subject which, through the courtesy of the Editors, are permitted to appear in this REVIEW.

It is hardly necessary to say that it is with the utmost diffidence that the writer ventures to invite scholars to consider and to criticise his suggestions. With our present progress in philology and in knowledge of the ancient Āryan as well as of the Semitic tongues, it ought to be possible to ascertain definitely the derivation and meaning of all, or almost all, the words of Āryan origin which occur in the Sacred Text.

We begin by quoting Dr. Driver's comment upon certain of these words which occur in Daniel and Ezra, in order to show how very necessary is such an inquiry as that upon which we are embarking.

In his note on Dan. 3, 2, נִדְבָר , *gēdābar*, in "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," he says: "An uncertain word. It *may* be a textual corruption, or a faulty pronunciation, of *gizbār*, 'treasurer' (Pehlevi *ganza-var*, Persian *ganjvar*), which is found in Ezr. 1, 8; 7, 21; it *may* have arisen by dittography from the following דִּתְבָר *dēthābar*; it *may* be an error for *haddābar* (in the plural נִדְבָרִיא for הִדְבָרִיא), the word which occurs in vv. 24, 27; 4, 36; 6, 7 (see on v. 24).¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, 37.

Let us now see whether further study will throw any light upon the derivation and meaning of *g^edābar*², and relieve us of being obliged to conjecture an error in the text, which is perhaps hardly a satisfactory thing to do whenever a word puzzles us.

In Avestic Persian we find the word *gadhā*, 'a club or mace.' In Sanskrit it occurs in two forms, *gada* and *gadā* with the same meaning. It is not found in the few Achæmenian Persian inscriptions known to us, but it would doubtless be *gadā* in that dialect. The termination *-bar* means 'bearer' and occurs in almost innumerable words in ancient and modern Persian, as does its equivalent *-φορος* in Greek. The whole word is therefore *gadābar* (or *gadhābar*), and it means 'mace-bearer.' In Sanskrit *gadā-bhrit* with the same signification occurs as a title of Krishna, just as its equivalent *claviger* does in Latin as applied to Hercules. The habit of including 'mace-bearers' among the officials in the train of kings and princes still exists in the East. In modern Persia the 'mace-bearer' is now styled *chūb-dār*, and he "carries a long staff with a large head covered with embossed silver." In India among the attendants of princes are still found 'mace-bearers' (in Urdū termed *sonṭe-bar-dār*). It is not entirely unknown in England to have such officials in the retinue of our Lord Mayors. That in Ancient Persia the 'mace-bearer' existed is known from classical writers. For instance, Xenophon mentions the high position of the *σκηπτουχος* at the Persian Court (*Cyropædia* VII, 3, 16; VIII, 1, 38; 3, 15). Tacitus (*Ann.* VI, 33) tells us the same of other Eastern courts. It is still more likely that the office

² We follow Canon Driver's system of neglecting all notice of *daghesh lene's* presence or absence in variable medial letters like *b*, *k*, etc. This is necessary in comparing Assyrian and Āryan words with Heb. and Aram.

existed in Babylon, where Herodotus (I, 195) informs us that every Babylonian man carried a staff (σκῆπτρον) with an ornate top. Hence both the derivation and the meaning of the word *gēdābar* seem clear.

Gizbār (גִּזְבָּר), which should doubtless be punctuated *gazzābar* (גַּזְזָבָר), is quite a different word and denotes, as has long been known, a 'treasurer.' The first part of the word is the old Persian *ganza*, 'treasure,' which in Greek assumed the form γάζα, thence being borrowed into Latin (*gazae*). In the biblical form of the word also, as shown above, the nasal is assimilated, as is usual in such cases. In Assyrian (Muss-Arnolt, I, 227) both *gunzu* and *ganzu* occur, doubtless borrowed from the Persian, and elsewhere in the Inscriptions we find *ganzabaru*, for what in Achæmenian Persian must have been *ganzābara*. This is evidently the original of the Aramaic *gizbār* (*gazzābar*). In Modern Persian the word is *ganjvar*. In this whole class of words it may be noticed that the ending *bar*, *bār*, *var* or *vār* (for it assumes all these forms) is the Sanskrit *bhar* (Greek -φορ-ος), so that the forms in *b* are older than those in *v*. The older form is also retained in English ('to bear') and Danish ('bare,'), cf. φέρ-ω, *fēr-o*.

The third word of our group is הֲדָבָר, *haddābar*, which the Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon renders 'counsellor, minister,' adding that it is a "Persian loan-word: original form and meaning dubious." Of course, the meaning of the final syllable is that which has just been explained in the preceding paragraph. Possibly the word should be הֲדַבָּר, *ḥaddābar*, not *haddābar*. If so, both meaning and derivation are quite clear. In Avestic Persian and in Sanskrit there is the root *khad*,³ 'to strike,

³ The *kh* of the Persian has not the same sound as *kh* in Sanskrit; but etymologically they correspond with one another.

to kill.' In Armenian, a cognate Āryan tongue, we have *khad*, 'a two-edged sword,' from this root. Another cognate root in Sanskrit is *khad* or *khaṇḍ*, with a cerebral *ḍ*, 'to divide.' From this comes the Sanskrit *khad-ga*, 'a sword,' whence the title *khadga-grāhin* or "sword-grasper," appellation of a particular dignitary. Hence the biblical word should be written חַדָּבָר, *ḥadābar*, and would in Achæmenian Persian represent *khadābara*, meaning 'sword-bearer.' But the Masoretic text may be correct with this meaning just as it stands, omitting the *dāghēsh forte* in the ד. For in Avestic we find not only *khad* but also the softer *had*, both meaning 'to strike.'

A careful study of these three words (גִּבּוֹר, גִּדּוֹר, and הַדָּבָר), therefore, instead of leading us to confound them with one another and to blame some unknown and ignorant copyist for blundering in transcription, proves that the text is correct, and enables us to fix both the etymology and the meaning of each.

THE SECULAR HEBREW POETRY OF ITALY

BY A. B. RHINE, Hot Springs, Ark.

PREFATORY REMARKS

THE present series of articles is, as far as I know, the first attempt at an exhaustive study of the secular Hebrew poetry written in Italy. As I had nothing of value to add to the study of religious Hebrew poetry which had already received careful treatment at the hands of such masters as Zunz, Dukes, Geiger, Rapoport, and others, I have confined myself to the secular branch of Hebrew song. Some Italian Hebrew poets are unfortunately inaccessible, being still buried in the libraries; nor was I able to acquire all the poetical works published, far away as I am from the centers of Jewish literary activity. I have, however, succeeded in accumulating quite a collection of Italian Hebrew poets; and, on several occasions, I was able to consult the Jewish Department of the New York Public Library as well as the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, with the result, I confidently believe, that no important poetic contribution escaped my notice.

In the treatment of the subject I followed Delitzsch, and it is on his "*Jüdische Poesie*" that this essay is based. Delitzsch, however, covering as he does the entire field of Hebrew poetry, is necessarily very brief in dealing with particular countries. Moreover, written as his work was in 1836, there is nearly a century of Hebrew poetry, and

the most important at that, that he had no possibility of touching upon at all. Slouschz's "*La Renaissance de la Littérature Hébraïque*" is devoted to Hebrew literature in general and treats of poetry only incidentally. I have, however, drawn freely upon Graetz, Karpeles, Güdemann, Kayserling, and Steinschneider, and have given them due credit in the Notes. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* was of special service to me, particularly in matters of biography, and I consulted the references whenever possible.

CHAPTER I

SECULAR POETRY: THIRTEENTH TO FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

Mediæval Hebrew poetry which had its origin in Jose b. Jose at the end of the sixth century was, for the most part, of a religious nature. Religious poetry always precedes secular poetry; and, with an essentially religious people like the Jews, and with a life of almost constant martyrdom which they were called upon to lead, it was but natural that their longings and aspirations, their woes and hopes, should find expression in religious songs, subsequently adopted into the liturgy. The development of secular poetry, an offspring of periods of ease and leisure, and an indication of a higher standard of civilization when a differentiation between things sacred and profane is already definitely fixed, was possible only in Spain. Born out of the exigencies of the bitter controversy between Dunash ben Labrat and Menahem b. Saruk and their disciples in the tenth century, introducing the panegyric in honor of Ibn Shaprut on the one hand, and the satire directed against one another by the combatants themselves, secular poetry made rapid strides in Spain. In the eleventh

and twelfth centuries we find it an integral part of the works of Ibn Gabirol, Samuel Hanagid, the Ibn Ezras, and Judah Halevi; until, in Harizi, it found its highest and final expression. In Italy, however, where the state of general culture was much lower than it was in Spain, particularly in Mohammedan Spain, we find no attempt at secular poetry until the middle of the thirteenth century. Liturgical poetry flourished in Italy already in the tenth century (Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, 104 ff.), and has a continuous history of nearly eight centuries. But the first Italian Hebrew poet who introduced a non-religious subject into Italian Hebrew poetry was Benjamin b. Abraham Anaw,¹ a Roman physician and prolific liturgical poet,² who wrote *מישא ניא חיון*,³ a satirical poem directed against the arrogance of the wealthy and the nobility, and *שערי עין חיים*,⁴ a rimed treatise on practical ethics. The latter poem consists of sixty-three stanzas in alphabetical order (omitting the letter ו and ט), each stanza containing a complete moral maxim, the acrostic Benjamin forming the opening and closing lines.

¹ Of the family Degli Mansi or Piatelli (Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 352); *מהעניים* dei Pietosi, Mortara, *Indice*; also called Benjamin Fanti (Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 280); Fonte or Ponte *על יד קובץ* I (Berlin 1885), 74, note; *בנימין מפנטו* ר' Dukes, *Annalen*, I, 84. The metrical Epilogue to the *Bet Middot*, the ethical work of Jehiel b. Jekuthiel b. Benjamin Anaw of Rome (1278) published by Gudemann (*Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Italien*, note XII, pp. 327-8) is written in the style and the spirit of Benjamin Anaw's *שערי עין חיים*. Was Jehiel a grandson of our Benjamin?

² Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 352-5; Landshuth, *Amude ha-'Abodah*, 51.

³ Riva di Trento 1560; in M. Wolf's *Zemirot Israel*, Lemberg 1859. It is written in rimed prose. Is this the work that Immanuel refers to in the twenty-third chapter of the *Maḥberet* (Berlin edition, 1796, 206) with so much derision and contempt? This work is erroneously ascribed to Benjamin Ashkenazi by Fürst, *Bib. Jud.*, I, 116.

⁴ *על יד קובץ* I (Berlin 1885), 71 ff.

There is, however, no originality of thought in the poem, since it is a mere paraphrase of biblical and rabbinic moral sayings; and, stylistically, it is rather commonplace, "*ohne Salz*," to quote Dukes (Jost's *Annalen*, I, 84). There is a total absence of meter, though the diction of the poem is biblical and simple. The artificiality of the title (each stanza is a "gate," the last line of which contains a biblical phrase ending in "*hayyim*") is in keeping with the conceits of the time.

Mediocre as was Anaw's attempt at secular poetry, the beginning was made; and the time was soon ripe for the appearance of a consummate artist and poet who was to raise secular Hebrew poetry in Italy to its zenith of splendor. The glorious era of Italian literature soon set in, the period of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. The stirring of a sense of art and poetry as a result of Dante's *Divina Commedia*, and the Revival of Learning led by Petrarch and Boccaccio brought about a general awakening on the part of the Italian people to the beauty of the classic literatures; and the birth of a national vernacular literature created an atmosphere of culture and a widespread intellectual ferment. This awakening naturally had its effect upon the Jews of Italy who formed an integral part of the population, and who had early identified themselves with the Italian language and culture (Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Italien*, 15). Moreover, the political condition of the Italian Jews during this period was a comparatively happy one, so that the poisoned shafts aimed against them by the Lateran Council (1215) fell almost harmlessly upon them. The preoccupation of the Popes with their ambition to fasten their hold upon the temporal affairs of all Christendom; the internecine warfare waged

by the Colonnas and Orsinis, the Ghibellines and the Guelphs; the jealousies and intrigues of each petty State, Duchy, and Principality against its neighbors and against all the rest in that period of anarchy; the extensive commerce and the great commercial undertakings of the maritime republics, with the consequent prosperity, in which the Italian Jews took an active and prominent part; all these tended to detract attention from the Jews, and to permit them to follow their pursuits and undertakings in comparative peace and security, so that some of them reached a high degree of wealth and influence. The close commercial intercourse between Jews and non-Jews in Italy led a close personal acquaintance, and to a feeling of mutual respect and confidence. The general prosperity and the freedom from disturbance and persecution which the Jews of Italy enjoyed enabled them to absorb the more readily the refining and humanizing influences of the new movement and to devote themselves with a greater zeal and a larger outlook to their own literature. The study of the Talmud received a great impetus through the efforts of the three Trans; philosophy found a warm friend in Hillel b. Samuel (1220-1295), the ardent champion of Maimonides, and a still more outspoken advocate in Zerahiah b. Shealtiel Hen, the Aristotelian rationalist; and there was hardly a Jewish scholar who was not acquainted with the science and the philosophy of the day. The example of Robert of Anjou who was a great admirer of Jewish literature, and a patron of the arts and the sciences, was not without its influence upon Jewish men of power and wealth. Like the Italian dukes and nobles, many Jewish princes of commerce played the part of Maecenas, encouraging Jewish scholars, grammarians, and rhetoricians, and enabling them materially to devote them-

selves undisturbed to their literary pursuits.⁵ Amidst this general intellectual activity, secular Hebrew poetry likewise revived, and found its highest expression in the inimitable Immanuel of Rome (c. 1270-1330).

Immanuel was to the Hebrew literature of Italy what Dante was to the Italian literature. Contemporaries and personal friends (Güdemann, *l. c.*, 137 ff.), Immanuel and Dante resemble each other in their uniqueness. Fundamentally differing in temperament—Dante somber, serious, gloomy, Immanuel cheerful, joyous, light-hearted—but each a master in his own field, these two poets stand in their respective literatures alone, unapproachable, supreme. Immanuel, combining the light, airy, inconsequential attitude of mind characteristic of sunny Italy, with the shrewd, keen, observant sense of humor characteristic of the Jew, is the satirist and humorist *par excellence* of the entire Hebrew literature. A supreme master of Hebrew diction and style, thoroughly at home in all Jewish as well as in the Italian and classic literature, Immanuel gave the most ingenious and final expression to that peculiarly mediæval Hebrew anomaly, the so-called mosaic style. With marvellous facility he borrows ready-made biblical and talmudic phrases, gathers them from all the four corners of the vast Jewish literature, places them side by side, member to member, bone to bone, his remarkable genius breathes into them the spirit of life, and, behold, they stand before the reader a brilliant array palpitating with life and thought. There is no incongruity in this massing together of widely scattered phrases; each phrase seems to fit perfectly into every other phrase resulting in a perfect whole, a unit. Moreover, in Immanuel the Hebrew muse assumed a brilliantly cheerful, even frivolous and erotic aspect.

⁵ See Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII, 258-275.

Spanish Hebrew poets, indeed, had sung of wine and of love, but in a reflective, chaste, and serious mood. Immanuel, however, abandons himself to the love of life, the joy of living, and the natural gaiety and buoyancy of his Italian temperament. He can be serious at times, even sad, solemn, and prayerful; but his sense of cheerfulness and humor asserts itself inevitably. At times he gives way to sentiments and expressions that must have scandalized the more serious-minded of his contemporaries, were it not for the happy, ingenious way in which they are couched. Genius covers a multitude of offenses. The last chapter of his *Mahberet* which is an imitation of Dante, and which lacks the vigor and brilliancy of his other work, only confirms the fact that Immanuel was original, and the humorist above all.

Immanuel speaks of contemporary poets (מליצי וחכמי * מליצי וחכמי *Mahberet*, VI), and one, Judah Siciliano, he praises very highly as a master of verse and style (*ibid.*, XIII), of whose works, however, nothing has been preserved. The other poets of the period referred to by Immanuel were liturgical poets.⁶ Kalonymos b. Kalonymos, the Provençal, was, indeed, greatly influenced by the brilliant Roman. His *Maseket Purim*, as Graetz pointed out (*Gesch. d. Juden*, VII, 264, n. 1), was certainly written in Rome, whither his duties at the court of Robert of Naples had led him about 1317-1322; even his *Eben Boḥan*, a satire in rimed prose, may have been conceived and partly written in Rome,⁷ though it was not finished in Italy. But Kalonymos, while possessing a clear, incisive style, cannot lay much claim to the name of poet; and as a Provençal, the study of his work belongs elsewhere.

⁶ Güdemann, *l. c.*, 145.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 47, note; Graetz, VII, 262, note 1.

Otherwise, Immanuel had no imitators or immediate successors. Hebrew poetry in Italy follows a parallel course with Italian poetry. Just as after the first outburst of Italian genius in the fourteenth century, the era of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, a period of almost complete barrenness set in until Lorenzo de Medici and Politian re-awakened the Italian lyre, so after the death of Immanuel in 1330, no Hebrew poet arose in Italy until, almost a century later, Moses da Rieti attempted to imitate Dante. Immanuel, highly appreciated in his own time, was neglected later on. The levity of his tone, the frivolity, often the irreverence, of his expressions, and, above all, the erotic note which prevails in his verse, did ill accord with the mood of gloom and despair in which Jewry all over Christendom was plunged in the following centuries. Still, while the mode of his thinking and the general tendency of his *Mahberet* did not exert a great influence upon Hebrew poetry, his brilliant style did. Subsequent rhetoricians quote him as an authority, and aspiring poets read his works eagerly, and take him as a model. The versification of the *Mahberet* is still that of the Arabic-Spanish school, but Immanuel has the distinction of being the first to introduce into Hebrew poetry the sonnet-form which Guittone de Arezzo had just transferred from the Provençal into the Italian. Thus Immanuel, the representative *par excellence* of mediævalism in its best sense, unconsciously paved the way for freedom from the bondage of Arabic prosody which held sway ever since the ninth century.

Moses b. Isaac da Rieti of Perugia (1388-1460), physician and philosopher, and master of both Hebrew and Italian, began his MIKDASH ME'AT (*Little Shrine*) in

1416.⁸ Of its two parts, altogether consisting of 1402 terzets, the first part, ULAM (*Entrance*), of five cantos, is an introduction to the history of Jewish literature, and a review of the most important systems of philosophy up to the time of Maimonides. The second part, HEKAL (*The Temple*), of eight cantos, is devoted to a description of the place where dwell the heroes and the great ones of Israel. It must have been the poet's intention, as Goldenthal suggested, to have the poem consist of three parts, ULAM, HEKAL, and DEBIR, to correspond to Dante's three divisions. As the writing of the poem was extended over a long period of years, it was not completed, for reasons unknown. Even the second part seems to be unfinished. The poem betrays Rieti's intimate knowledge of Hebrew literature, and his close acquaintance with philosophy, inasmuch as he leads in review all the Tannaim, Amoraim, and Geonim, up to his own day, and the leading Greek, Arabic, and Jewish philosophers. While not of much value as a poem (for the most part only a rimed chronicle, as Karpeles suggests, *Geschichte der Jüdischen Literatur*, 1886, II, 745), it is not without its critical value. Rieti found it necessary to exclude from his paradise Immanuel of Rome "because he sang of love" (*Mikdash Me'at*, 106a) (for which, as Graetz wittily remarks, Immanuel should have been thankful, because he would have found Rieti's *Eden* exceedingly tedious), as well as several Jewish philosophers, such as Isaac Albalag, Levi b. Gerson, Moses Narboni (p. 102b, n. 3), as heretics, and an unknown Spanish writer, Mustin de Huerara, because "he wrote against the Kabbalah." In his old age Rieti's attitude towards the study of philosophy seems to have undergone a com-

⁸ Edited and published by I. Goldenthal, Vienna 1851. On Rieti see Goldenthal's Introduction to the *Mikdash Me'at*, and Graetz, VIII, 157-9.

plete change. It is said that he gave himself up entirely to the Kabbalah, even expressing a regret that he had ever occupied himself with philosophic pursuits.

That Rieti's work was held in high esteem in his own day, is attested by the fact that Italian communities adopted some of his poems into the ritual (Canto 2 of *Hekal*, divided into seven parts, one for each day of the week), and read portions thereof daily. Deborah Ascarelli and Lazaro Viterbo deemed some of his hymns worthy of being translated into Italian. However, he surely does not deserve the extravagant praise bestowed upon him by Delitzsch and Goldenthal, and, least of all, the honorable designation of the "Hebrew Dante." In fact, he lacked not only the depth, the power of imagination, and the sublimity of Dante, but there is a total absence of poetic feeling in his lines, with the exception of a few stanzas of Cantos I and II of the *HEKAL*. In the formation of his stanza, and the easy flow of his rimes, he is indeed very happy; and he helped further to wean Hebrew poetry away from the Spanish-Arabic monotonous rime-ending by introducing the *terza rima* so effectively employed by Dante.⁹ Moreover, he refused "to play with biblical verses," a misuse of the Bible so characteristic of his contemporaries. Intrinsically, however, his diction is often uncouth, and he betrays an absence of poetic appreciation by many conceits and puerilities.

Of Rieti's contemporaries only one, Solomon da Piena (lived early in the fifteenth century), is mentioned as the author of a short clever Purim epigram (Steinschneider, "Purim und Parodie," *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des*

⁹ Like Dante's, Rieti's lines contain ten syllables, counting a *shewa mobile* as a syllable; but while Dante's rimes are feminine, Rieti's are masculine. Rieti employs the term "*Regel*" for poetic "foot."

Juden thums, 1903, 173). Moses Ibn Ḥabib (died at the beginning of the sixteenth century), a native of Lisbon which he left before the expulsion, living for a time in the Levant, finally settling in Southern Italy, is by far the most important of Rieti's immediate successors. A grammarian, translator, and philosopher, his treatise on Hebrew prosody *DARKE NO'AM* (*Ways of Pleasantness*), written in Bitonto, Apulia, in 1486, is a lucid and valuable contribution to the science of poetics and to Hebrew poetry itself. Based upon Aristotle's *Poetics*, but modified to suit the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry,¹⁰ he lays down ten rules of prosody, illustrating each form of verse and meter by original poems. There is, indeed, little poetic feeling in his lines. In style, he is often homonymic and stilted, twisting biblical phrases and proper names out of their context in order to give an ingenious and witty turn to his verse. Such, however, was the norm of Spanish Hebrew poetry, and he is characteristically a Spaniard, designating himself *SEPHARDI* with evident pride (*Darke No'am*, p. 4, Roedelheim edition, 1806; likewise at the beginning of the introduction to his Commentary on *בחינת עולם*, Ferrara 1552). As a stylist, according to the standard of his day, he is a master, and as a versifier, he is perfect. There is a swing and a rhythm to his opening poem (3-4a) for instance, that are very graceful. His thoughts are not above mediocrity, and his language is frequently so idiomatic as to be untranslatable. The charm of his verse consists in the cleverness of the style, not in the originality of thought. Thus:

¹⁰ He maintains that rime had been employed already in biblical times, and tells of the rimed inscription which he saw on a tombstone in Valencia supposedly that of the general of Amaziah, King of Judah. This inscription proves to Ibn Ḥabib the antiquity of Hebrew rime. Azariah dei Rossi refutes this theory in chapter 60 of his *מאור עינים*.

אם אשתך רעה ולא תשמע לקול
 שיחד לשרתך ורע חורשת;
 דע כי במקל עז לפרה סוררה
 תישיר תלמיה והיא חורשת.

The pun is on חורשת.¹¹

The tone of levity affected towards woman as indicated in the above quotation from Ḥabib, is not isolated. There is quite a number of poets towards the end of the fifteenth century who discussed woman, in the abstract, be it stated, and a fierce battle *pro* and *con* is waged. Thus, about 1492, Abraham da Sarteano wrote his *SONE NASHIM*¹² (*Misogynist*), a poem consisting of 50 terzets of ten syllables each,¹³ which is a fierce arraignment of woman. Women, in his opinion, are the cause of all the mischief existing in the world. Eve made Adam lose paradise, and the poet cites a long list of women from the Bible and the classic and contemporary Italian literatures who have brought down misfortune upon man. The language of the poem is simple and clear, without frills, though not forcible, and shows the influence of contemporary Italian literature though not of the best type. On the other hand, Abigdor da Fano in *MAGEN NASHIM* (*Letterbode*, X, 101-3) joins issue with Sarteano, and takes up the cudgel in behalf of the fair sex. He cites the many noble women of history, such as Jael, Esther, and Judith, and pays a graceful tribute to a lady of his acquaintance, married to a gentleman of Pisa, who is her "husband's crown." His

¹¹ On Ḥabib see *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v.; Karpeles, *Geschichte d. Jüdischen Literatur*, II, 875 ff.

¹² Published by Neubauer in *Letterbode*, X, 98-101. On the entire subject see Steinschneider, *Zur Frauenliteratur*.

¹³ In his introduction to the poem (*Letterbode*, X, 98), he uses the phrase רגלים י' for ten feet, counting the *shewa mobile* as a syllable like Rieti.

poem also consists of 50 terzets, after the model of Sar-teano, and like his, it is clear but lacking in vigor. Elijah Ḥayyim b. Benjamin da Genzano¹⁴ comes to the defense of Abraham Sarteano whom he calls a great rhetorician (מליץ נורא). Good women are the exception, he maintains in MELIZOT (*Letterbode*, X, 104-5); and rails at Fano for daring to champion the cause of women even the best of whom such as Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah were guilty of grievous offenses. Of Fano's poem as such he speaks with contempt as written against the rules of Hebrew prosody, and as intrinsically "full of lies and vanity." Genzano is evidently a younger man than either of the other two, as indicated by the opening lines of the poem כאשר הייתי בימי חרפי. The MELIZOT contain 38 terzets and one additional line which would indicate that the poem is incomplete, the poet very likely intending to write 50 terzets as his predecessors did (Steinschneider, *Zur Frauenliteratur*, 62). An anonymous poet in TESHUBAH LE-MAGEN NASHIM (*Letterbode*, XI, 62-65), likewise defends Abraham Sarteano's position as against Abigdor da Fano. Finally, Daniel b. Samuel of Rossena (Mortara, *Indice*: Daniel b. Samuel Rofo b. Samuel Dayyan), on the first of Nisan 1492, in a poem of 50 terzets steps into the fray, and settles the quarrel by rebuking the combatants for taking up such a delicate subject at all. On the mooted question itself he is non-committal, which proves the diplomat. His poem opens and closes with a five line acrostic of his name, Daniel (*Letterbode*, XI, 65-68; Steinschneider, *Zur Frauenliteratur*, 57).¹⁵

¹⁴ He is also the author of a satire on Christianity written after the model of יגדל in Don David Nasi's הוראת בעל דין, edited by Jacob Sopher, Frankf. a. M. 1866. I have not seen it.

¹⁵ A quatrain and five-lined acrostic on a Purim King named Eliezer written by Daniel of Rossena are quoted by Steinschneider, in "Purim

The fact that Daniel of Rossena manifests astonishment that such men discussed a subject of this nature would indicate that these poets were men of standing, and certainly men of learning. The very choice of the subject and the selection of the *terza rima* as the form show the influence upon them of contemporary Italian literature. These poets, however, evince no originality either of thought or expression. They were mere rimesters. The decay of the Italian Hebrew poetry of the fifteenth century cannot be more strikingly illustrated than by a comparison of the work of these verse-makers with that of Immanuel on this very subject.

CHAPTER II

POETS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The decline of true poetry, as indicated by Rieti and more strongly emphasized by his successors, continued through the first half of the sixteenth century. In other departments of intellectual activity Italian Jews took a prominent part, made possible, indeed, by the comparatively secure political condition of Italian Jewry which was, as yet, undisturbed. Jehiel of Pisa, in the last two decades of the fifteenth century, controlled the money market of Tuscany. Jews were the leading physicians, and were employed not only by the nobility and royalty, but even by the princes of the church and by the Popes themselves, in spite of the decree of the Council of Beziers (May, 1246). Moreover, the Humanists, as a result of the revival of interest in antiquity, began to turn their attention also to the study of Hebrew and Jewish literature, especially the

und Parodie" (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, XL, 174), and by Dr. Israel Davidson in his *Parody in Jewish Literature*, p. 27.

Kabbalah, and to Jewish Arabic philosophy. To accomplish the first, they needed Jewish teachers; to accomplish the second purpose, Jewish translators. Such eminent scholars as Pico della Mirandola, Cardinal Egidio de Viterbo, and Cardinal Domenico Grimani sat at the feet of Jewish scholars. This interest in Jewish studies naturally brought the best spirits among Jews and Christians in close and intimate contact, and led many Jews to a participation in the humanistic movement. Jewish youths attended Italian universities, spoke Italian, and wrote both Italian and Latin. With the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, many Spanish Jews found refuge in Italy, whither they introduced their own, higher culture, which reacted favorably upon the Jews of Italy, and added to their intellectual ferment. Italian Jews were the first to take advantage of the invention of printing, and Hebrew presses were established in Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Soncino, Naples, and other places. Already in the second half of the fifteenth century, Messer Leon (Judah b. Jehiel), physician as well as rabbi of Mantua, and a classic scholar, wrote a Hebrew Rhetoric (NOFET ZUFIM), comparing the Hebrew with the classic languages, and advocated the study of the classic literatures; and Elias del Medigo taught philosophy not only to Jews, in his BEHINAT HA-DAT, but above all to non-Jews, at Padua and Florence, and was called upon by the University of Padua to decide a philosophic dispute which divided the professors and students thereof into two contending parties. In the sixteenth century, we find David Ibn Jahia teaching Talmud and Hebrew grammar in Naples, under the patronage of the famous Samuel Abrabanel and his wife Benvenida Abrabanela; Judah and his son Abraham Menz are at the head of the great Talmudic and Rabbinic school at Padua;

Abraham Farissol (1458-1525) of Ferrara is occupying himself with Geography (IGGERET ORHOT 'OLAM); Jacob Mantin, physician to Pope Paul III, is translating from Hebrew and Arabic into Latin works on medicine and metaphysics; and Abraham de Balnes (c. 1450-c. 1503, of Lecce), physician to and friend of Cardinal Domenico Grimani, and especially Elias Levita (1469-1549) of Rome, teacher of Cardinal Viterbo and other eminent Christians, are busying themselves with the study of Hebrew grammar; while Azariah dei Rossi was about to revolutionize Jewish science with his deep and keen sense of criticism, thus opening up a new and vast field for Jewish scholarship.

Amidst so much literary and intellectual activity we might reasonably expect to meet with at least a few poetic spirits, if not of the towering greatness of an Immanuel—supreme geniuses are produced at rare intervals—, at least of the class of Petrarchists, imitators, shining by reflected glory. Yet in the first half of the sixteenth century we look in vain for even one poet. It is especially strange that, since Jews spoke and wrote Italian, Ariosto and the younger Tasso should have exerted no influence whatever upon their Hebrew contemporaries. The influence of the Petrarchists, who were mostly lyric poets, should have been of special service to Jewish singers who cared to pour forth their souls in laments and dirges which are necessarily lyric. Still no poet appeared to sing the songs of Zion. This lack of poetic productivity may be partly ascribed to the absorption of the Jewish scholars, to which group the poets usually belonged, in the first half of the sixteenth century, in talmudic, rabbinic, philosophic, and grammatical pursuits to the exclusion of everything else. At any rate, all that has come down to us from this period is a few rimes, not deserving the name of poetry. Israel

of Cortina, in the tenor of Abraham Sarteano, wrote at Sienna, in 1530, a poem on woman under the name of תוכחת נשים (published by Neubauer in *Letterbode*, XI, 88-92), consisting of eighty-four decasyllabic terzets, with two quatrains as a conclusion. Though he does not mention Sarteano and his fellow combatants, their work must have been known to him. The employment of *terza rima*, as Steinschneider suggested (*Zur Frauenliteratur*), is not accidental, but rather in imitation of his predecessors. On the whole, the poet is a misogynist, though he admits that there are some noble women, and happy indeed is the man to whose lot a good woman falls. The poet confined his remarks to biblical women, acknowledging that he was not acquainted either with non-Jewish women or with non-Jewish books, "since all their doings were of no value":

לא מימי קראתי ספריהן
להבין ולהשכיל אשר עשו
כי תהו ובהו כל עסקיהן.

On the whole, this poem is of a piece with that of his predecessors, lacking both vigor and wit. Elias Levita is more serious and ambitious; but, great as is his merit as a grammarian, he had a very poor conception of the function of poetry, or he would not have undertaken the impossible task of writing a poetic grammar! While, to do him justice, his PEREK SHIRAH, the first part of PIRKE ELIJAH (Soncino 1520), was intended merely as a mnemonic, the very conception of such an attempt proves that he had eyes only for form and cared nothing for true poetic thought and feeling. One specimen of these *songs* will suffice:

"And now I sing a glorious song
In words explicit, plain;
And of the vowels ten will speak

That part in classes twain:
 And five of these are giant tall,
 And five like pigmies small."

(Song 2, p. 48*b*, second edition, Venice 1546).

Truly poetic figures, these, for the long and short vowels! His versification, moreover, is all after the Jewish-Spanish model, and has therefore no special value even from the point of view of form, though it may have served its purpose as a mnemonic. Moses Provençale, rabbi of Mantua (1503-1577), took Levita as his model, and wrote another poetic grammar, entirely in the spirit of the *PIRKE ELIJAH*, under the title of *BE-SHEM KADMON* (*In the Name of an Ancient*; not *BOSEM KADMON*, *An Ancient Blossom*, as read erroneously by Delitzsch). This poem was written in 1535, and published in Venice in 1597 (Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.*, s. v.).

The second half of the sixteenth century, however, was more productive of poetic efforts. The burning of the Talmud in the papal states and other Italian cities by order of Pope Julius III (Sept. 9, 1553) called forth a cry of despair from Mordecai b. Judah de Blanes,¹⁶ and Jacob b.

¹⁶ Mordecai de Blanes' elegy on the burning of the Talmud is published in the *החלוץ*, XIII, 109, and consists of 27 monorimes, written in the style characteristic of *קינות*. His elegy on the Ancona martyrs used to be recited by the community of Pesaro on the ninth of Ab, but is not extant (Graetz, IX, 344, 3). Hazzan's *kinah* was published in the *לבנון*, V, 343 (I have not been able to obtain a copy of it). Fano's elegy was published at Ferrara, 1556 (Steinschneider, *C.B.*, 5528; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.*), in his *Shilte ha-Gibborim*, and reprinted in the *REJ.*, XI, 154 ff., by D. Kaufmann. There seems, however, to be some confusion as to the authorship of this *kinah*. Kaufmann, in the article just quoted, thinks that, of the 47 *terse rime*, stanzas 1-30 were written by Fano, while the remaining seventeen, commemorating the burning of the Talmud in 1553, belong to an anonymous poet. On the other hand, Isaac Raphael Ashkenazi, rabbi of Ancona, in *תולדות בני ישראל*, 13-18 (Cracow 1901), reprints the same poem (44).

Joab Elijah da Fano of Bologna and Ferrara; and the martyrdom of the twenty-four Marannos at Ancona by order of Pope Paul IV (May, 1556)—a tragedy which shocked all Jewry throughout Europe—stirred the above named poets and Solomon Hazzan, to commemorate that terrible event in their respective קינות which, however, are rather weak, and not at all commensurate with the enormity of the outrage. About the same time, woman again received her share of attention on the part of a number of poets, and the merry, rather bloodless, battle raged about her. Judah (Leon) Sommo da Porta-Leone of Bologna, a pupil of da Fano, and a close friend of Azariah dei Rossi, in answer to attacks on woman, probably by the anonymous author of DABAR BE-'ITTO (*Letterbode*, X, 114), came to her defense in a poem MAGEN NASHIM (about 1556) in which he protests against the woman-hater, quoting the names of noble women mentioned in the Bible and other literature, concluding with a glowing description of the charms of a lady whom he does not mention by name, only intimating that she lived in Bologna (Hannah Rieti, wife of Reuben Sullam; Karpeles, *Gesch. der Jüd. Lit.*, II, 840). His friend and compatriot Jacob da Fano mentioned above, replied with a collection of poems under

terze rime), and speaks of it as ascribed to Mordecai de Blanes, and as read in Ancona on the ninth of Ab (p. 13). Judging from the fact that de Blanes did not employ the *terza rima* in his elegy on the Talmud, while Fano uses it in all his poems, it is probable that Fano was the author of the *kinah*. According to Kaufmann (*REJ.*, XI, 150-51) this *kinah* was probably confiscated and burned at the instigation of Cardinal Ghislieri who, on Feb. 4, 1559, complained to the Duke of Ferrara of a book written in praise of the Marannos "who were justly burned," and sought to punish both the author and the printer. This poem, while of slight literary value, is of great historic importance, since it gives the names of the martyrs, and establishes the historicity of the *autos-da-fé* which some church historians were attempting to deny (Graetz, XI, 344, n. 3).

the name of SHILTE HA-GIBBORIM,¹⁷ the most important of which consists of sixty terzets. He acknowledges the greatness and glory of woman; only that man was intended by God to be of prime importance. Good-naturedly he rails at Leon Portaleone ascribing his advocacy of woman's cause to youthful inexperience. Da Fano acknowledges that he knows of woman only from hear-say, that he was always afraid of woman, but since the Bible and all other literatures agree that women have been the cause of man's downfall more than once, and, as the Biblical examples alone are sufficient to illustrate his argument, his position concerning woman's inferiority is sustained. On the whole, there is little cleverness and still less humor in the poem. An anonymous poet discusses the same question in the form of a dialogue of thirty-six terzets between Jacob and Deborah, and criticises both Portaleone and Fano and is really the cleverest and most logical. Deborah argues that in lowering the dignity of woman man is lowering his own dignity, and takes Jacob to task for hating woman, since God made woman to be man's helpmate. Jacob, driven to the wall, replies:

אוי לי (מי לא יצעק) עזרה מצר,
 כי לתת מוהר לכל בנותי
 לא יספיק בביתי הון ואוצר.

"Who would not cry for help? O woe is me!
 Of daughters I have plenty, but have not
 The means to give to each a dowery!"

¹⁷ Neubauer, *Letterbode*, X, 124-33; *REJ.*, XI, 154-5; Neppi-Ghirondi, *תולדות גדולי ישראל*, Triest, 1853, 210; Steinschneider, *Zur Frauen-literatur*, 66; and C. B. Fuenn, *Kneset Israel*, s. v.; Mortara, *Indice*, 21. Mortara's reference to Abraham Portaleone's *Shilte ha-Gibborim*, 106, is erroneous; it should read p. 185b, where Portaleone speaks of himself as a pupil of Jacob Fano's in Talmud and Posekim.

And the war of words is thus ended. (Steinschneider, *Zur Frauenliteratur*, 73-75).

That men of the standing of Jacob da Fano, rabbinical scholars of high attainments, should engage in such trivial discussions, and should speak of women in such a tone of levity apparently taking the matter seriously, since there is a total absence of wit and humor in their discussion, is really astonishing. It simply shows the influence of their environment, "an echo of the romantic poetry of the Renaissance which spread the cult of the beautiful also among the Jews" (Karpeles, II, 840), though judging from the absence of taste and refinement, they absorbed only its grosser qualities. Happily, these were the exceptions. The other poets of the period were men of deeper thought, of finer sensibility, and of a truer appreciation of the scope of poetry.

The two foremost Italian scholars of the sixteenth century, Azariah dei Rossi (1513 or 14-1578), and Judah (Leon) Moscato, both of Mantua, as was usual with all rabbis and scholars, also tried their hands at poetry. While not great poets, the difference between their works and those of the scribblers who preceded them is sufficiently striking. Dei Rossi, a man of universal culture, physician, historian, archæologist, and rabbinic scholar, interspersed his epoch-making work *ME'OR 'ENAYIM* (Mantua 1573-75) with six poems. The clearness, vigor, and naturalness of his prose are enhanced in his poetic lines, and indicate the ease, the grace, and the mastery of style of which dei Rossi is capable. He is not altogether free from the artificialities and artifices employed by the stylists of his time; his lines are monorimes, following the Spanish-Arabic fashion; but they are lucid and vigorous. The introductory and the concluding poems of *IMRE BINAH*, in the

nature of prayers, are bold and defiant to the enemies of light and truth. He is conscious of the merits of his work, and throws down the gauntlet to the hypocrites and fools who condemn him:

ואפס — עם פתאים או צבועים
והעוטים מעילי הכחשים
ברית אכרות לבלתי יגעו בו
הלא הם ישכּוּהו כנחשים,
בשגם יהרום הוא מלתעותם
בעז משפט ואמרי פיו לחשים.

(*Imre Binah*, c. 60).

Elegant is his address to the reader in the third introductory poem to the same work:

הן נטעתי נפש זכה
נטעי מדע כדמות גנה
בואי וקחי כטוב לך
איזה פרי או שושנה.
ובהשיגך דבר נחמד
רק לאלהים פצחי רנה
כי הוא נותן לקנות חכמה
עוז ולהבין אמרי בינה.

"A soul serene I planted here,
And knowledge-seeds within this field;
At leisure come and pluck at will,
And may it fruits and roses yield.
And if a pleasant thing you find
Then praises sing unto the Lord:
For He it is who wisdom gives,
And He the understanding word."

The assurance of faith is expressed in the epitaph which he composed on himself:

מִן יָם סְעֵרוֹת הֵן אֵלֵי הַחוֹף
בָּאתִי וּמָה קָדִים אֲשֶׁר אִירָא,
אֲשַׁחֵק לַתְּהוֹכוֹת זְמַן אֲכֹזֵב
לֹא יִהְיֶה עוֹד לִי אֵלֵי זֶרָא;
יִקְשֶׁה בִּסְחָרֵי אִם יִהְיֶה רְצוּי
לְשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר לְכָל בֶּשֶׁם יִקְרָא
אֵךְ הוּא בְּרָאֲנִי וְלֹא אֲחֶסֶר
חֶסְדּוֹ שֶׁהוּא מִפְּלִיא לְכָל נִבְרָא.

"From out the stormy sea unto the shore
I came, and fear the hurricane no more;
I laugh at lying Time's upheavals, I
His strange perverse mirages do defy.
It may go hard with my account if He
Who nameth all so please to deal with me:
He is my God, and even I will share
The lavish grace He scatters everywhere."

(*ibid.*).¹⁸

Judah (Leon) Moscato (died before 1594) who, like dei Rossi is a child of the Renaissance, the commentator of Halevi's *Kuzari*, and whose NEFUZOT JEHUDAH (*Venice* 1588) is as epoch-making in the field of homiletics as dei Rossi's is in that of historic criticism, also

¹⁸ He is said to have been informed in a dream of the exact day of his death which prophecy he reduced to the following quatrain:

עַל מִשְׁכְּבִי שׁוּחָה, כִּסְלִי שֵׁן לְמֹד הָא
נִדְמָה לִי אֹמֵר הָא, לֶךְ עוֹד שְׁלוֹשׁ שָׁנִים
לִכֵּן כִּסְלוֹ ש"ל"ח רוּחִי אֵל עַל יִצְלַח
אֲנִי רַב טוֹב סֶלַח, תִּשְׁלַג צִלְמוֹן שָׁנִים.

The genuineness of the composition of the above quatrain is vouched for by Leon de Modena who claims to have had a copy of it in dei Rossi's handwriting. According to Modena, the dream came true. S. D. Luzzatto saw the lines in an old manuscript (S. J. Rapoport in *Kerem Chemed*, V, 159-63, and I. Broyde in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*).

tried his hand at verse-writing. Like dei Rossi's, his lines are elegant and finished, though more stilted, and not so flexible. The poems that have come down to us are elegies, one on Samuel Cases, one on Joseph Caro, and three on the Duchess Margarita of Savoy, who died September 15, 1574,¹⁹ of which by far the strongest is that on Joseph Caro, composed of three sestets, containing some lyric touches. The three Savoy poems, a sonnet, an octave acrostic on Margarita, and a quatrain, hardly betray "the greatness of his pure, poetic soul," as his Hebrew biographer claims (Abba Apfelbaum, **ספר תולדות הג' ר' יהודה מוסקאטו**, 59). The first and second are well written, but with little spontaneity; while the third which is so artificially composed as to be read either forward or backward is unintelligible either way. His meter is that of the Spanish school.

A more spontaneous poet is Menaḥem b. Judah Lonzano (died after 1610²⁰ in Jerusalem). A native of Italy, though spending the greater part of his life at Jerusalem, and visiting his native land every now and then, a poverty-stricken wanderer, this Masoretic scholar and lexicographer had a keen eye and a still keener pen. Wandering from place to place, he had many opportunities of observing the inner life of his people and the picture he paints is not at all an attractive one, though allowance must be made for poetic license in exaggeration. His poems are

¹⁹ These poems are published in Abba Apfelbaum's scholarly biography of Leon Moscato (Drohobycz 1900), pp. 55-59. Apfelbaum's estimation of Moscato's poetic power is rather exaggerated. He refers to three elegies by Azariah dei Rossi in honor of the same Duchess (**מאור עינים**, ed. Cassel) and compares them with those of Moscato to the advantage of the latter. I do not recollect dei Rossi's poems referred to; nor have I at present a copy of Cassel's edition.

²⁰ In **טובה תוכחת** (שתי ידות, 134a, Venice 1618) he says: **וזה שנים חמש מאות ואלף וארבעים אשר חרב דבירי**; hence 1610.

contained in the third, fourth, and fifth division of the first part of his chief work SHTE YADOT (*Two Hands* or *Two Parts*, divided into five "fingers" each).

His 'ABODAT MIKDASH (*Service of the Sanctuary*), the third "finger," consists of religious hymns some of which are so hopelessly Kaliric and obscure that we must thank the poet for his foresight in providing them with a commentary. At times, however, carried away by deep, fervent feelings, as he bewails the lot of his people, the poet forgets all labored conceits, and pours forth his soul in clear, vigorous lines that cannot but move the reader. The "Fourth Finger" DEREK HAYYIM (*Path of Life*, so called both because it is suggested by the verse ודרך חיים תוכחת מוסר, and also because the numerical value of ודרך חיים, 298, corresponds to the number of verses in the poem proper exclusive of the eight opening and nine closing lines), is a collection of moral sayings, a didactic poem intended as a guide for the young. It deals with all possible relations of life, teems with sound advice, the result of human experience, and its moral tone is very lofty. But the most important, because the most vivid, his TOKAHAT MUSAR, the "fifth finger," divided into fifteen cantos. In it he passes in panoramic review the characteristic foibles of his time, and arraigns his generation for their dereliction of duty. Thus he rails against the habits of swearing and of telling falsehoods which he calls a מכת מדינה (Canto III, line 40); against the desire to get rich quick (איץ להעשיר, 1. 57); against the negligence of the study of ritual laws, indulging in this piece of biting irony:

המוני יפתחו דלתות חנותם, וכל דלתי ספריו סגורי,
ודי להם בתורת אִם ומצוה מלומדה ביד אשה ונערי,
ודי להם כללים שבירם כצום כפור והשתכר בפורי,
.....

"The doors of shops the crowds unlock,
But lock secure the doors of books;
Enough for them the mother's lore,
And rites by women, tyros taught;
Enough for them the common rules,
Like Kippur's fast and Purim's drink."

לביבות עם גבינה בחנוכה, ריקים בדבש, הדלק לגרי,
ובפסח אכול מצה ומרור וחרוסת ולשבית את שארי,
קנות יין ובשר מן יהודי, שמע לקרות בכל ערבי ושחרי;
והתפלל בפיהו ולא בלבו

"For Feast of Lights the noodles, cheese,
The honey cakes, and candles lit;
For Pesah Mazzot, bitter herbs,
Haroset, leaven out of sight;
Wine, meat must from a Jew be bought,
The Shema' be read both morn and night,
And pray with lip but not with heart."

(lines 63-65, 66-70). He denounces those who neglect מוֹחוֹת, who shave their beards, who wear high hats:

וישאו אוהבי רבם בראשם דמות כדור כעין שולי קדרי,

(line 90): who refuse to contribute to the support of scholars:

ואמור אומרים להם לכו נא, בלא כסף שברו ובלא מחירי,
לעצמי לא אלמוד דת ותורה ומה חפצי לכלכל לאחרי,

(113-14); who judge a person by his dress and not according to his worth:

כפי מְדִי וכתנתני וכמעיל וצניף כן כבודי והדרי,
אהה על דור יכבד בגדים ולו היו על סוס ועירי,

“My glory, honor, all depend
Upon my shirt and cloak and hat:
Alas! An age that honors clothes
Though worn by horse or ass!”

(lines 127-28). He protests against the lack of hospitality to the poor (Canto IX), ridicules the cantors:

ולא יצטרכו שום לב לבד קול בקול שחל בקול שורי,
.....

הלא בעי ללבא רחמנא ולא פומא בלא לבא דלישרי

“They need no heart at all; they need
A voice, a lion’s voice or bull’s;
But does not God a heart demand,
And not a heartless shouting mouth?”

(lines 216, 229); and the extravagance of woman’s dress (Canto XI). He condemns the absence of sympathy with the poor of Jerusalem:

ולא יאמין שבעי אל רעבי, ולא יאמין לדל שליו ובריא

(line 273); and scorns the younger generation for giving up the study of the Torah in order to devote themselves to business:

עזוב תורה, נטוש מצוה בני, לך קחה חנות, למד מסחר סחרי.

“Forsake the law, leave the commandments, son;
Go get a shop, and learn the tradesman’s art.”

Aside from its intrinsic value as a fine work of satire, the poem throws light upon the social life of the Jewish people of his time. But one must not take Lonzano too literally. He doth protest too much. Possibly the poetic vagabond experienced some of the unpleasant things he describes, and he denounced his generation for the shortcomings of the few.

The last poet of this period is Samuel b. Elhanan Isaac Archevolti of Padua (died 1611). A grammarian like the others, he treats grammar in the prosaic manner its nature demands, and his prose is free and easy, a virtue rather rare in those days. But, in the thirty-first and thirty-second chapter of his 'ARUGAT HA-BOSEM (*A Bed of Spices*, Venice 1602) in which he treats of Prosody and Poetry, he proves himself if not a poet, at least a man capable of poetic appreciation. In chapter 31, he protests against the practice prevalent in his day of singing sacred songs of the liturgy to the tune of popular and often vulgar melodies,²¹ which shows his sense of propriety. In Chapter 32, in treating of Prosody, he gives an elaborate account of the technique of versification, the structure of the meter and stanza, and their various forms. He emphasizes the necessity of proper accentuation, warns the reader against the reprehensible practice so common in mediæval Hebrew poetry of dividing a word at the end of a verse for the sake of the meter; and especially against the license of the Payyetanîm in forming nouns and verbs *ad libitum* out of biblical roots against all canons of grammar to the point of unintelligibility, and to the deterioration of the Hebrew language. The specimens of his own composition in illustration of the vari-

²¹ This was a practice indulged in by Menaḥem Lonzano who set many of his hymns to "Arabic melodies because these, on account of their melancholy, were better adapted to arouse feelings of devotion and humility (*Shte Yadot*, 65b); or because they sound more solemn (*ibid.*, 142a). He is well aware of the fact that high authorities are opposed to the use of foreign melodies in religious worship, but he does not share their view. At the same time he objects most strenuously to the practice of imitating the sound of foreign words by means of Hebrew assonants. He condemns, for instance, the use of "*Shem Nora*" in imitation of the Italian song "*Signora*"; and he felt impelled to declare before God and Israel that he used foreign terms only to praise the Lord and not for profane or frivolous purposes (quoted from M. Schloessinger's article on Lonzano in the *J.E.*, *Shte Yadot*, p. 122a).

ous forms of meter and stanza are not of a high order of poetry, though they are written in a clear, often forcible biblical diction, and free from a slavish usage of ready-made biblical phrases. Some of his lines even betray lyric feeling and grace, and some of his epigrams are witty and clever, and sound quite modern, as, for instance, the following:

“When’er a bitter foe attack thee,
Then sheathe thy sword, thy wrath restrain:
For else will magistrates and lawyers
Divide thy wealth, thy purse retain.”

(p. 119a). Law-suits in those days must have been considered as expensive as they are to-day, which proves that the sixteenth century was not so much behind us after all.

On the whole, Archevolti’s work is a marked progress over his contemporaries. While his meter is still governed by the Spanish-Arabic model, the formation of his stanzas, the place he gives to the sonnet as a recognized form of Hebrew versification, and, above all, his clear style, not altogether free from punning and conceits which, however, are used only rarely and not at all emphasized, show the influence of Italian literary forms, and point the road to his successors.

CHAPTER III

POETS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The seventeenth century marks the real period of transition in Italian Hebrew poetry. The beauty of diction and of form, the perfection of versification and the elegance of style so characteristic of the Italian literature of the sixteenth century, began at last to make themselves felt in Hebrew literature also. An attempt is made to do away

with the characteristically involved and complicated style of the middle ages, and to substitute a clear biblical diction instead. In the outward form of verse-building a complete revolution has taken place. The old, artificial monorime, with its still more artificial meter in which the half-vowel, the *Sheva*, plays such a prominent part, is replaced by the Italian meter, and its rich variety of stanza. The octave, the six line stanza, the quatrain, and *terza rima* are used quite extensively, and the sonnet has become not only recognized but a favorite form of versification. The scope of Hebrew poetry has also enlarged. While we find Abraham Samuel of Venice (died 1650) in his *SHIRAT DODI* (*The Song of My Beloved*, Venice 1719), undertaking the enormous task of reducing to rime the entire tractate Sabbath of the Babylonian Talmud; and, at the end of the century the brilliant young son of Moses b. Gerson, Gentile (Hefez) (1663-1711) Gerson, who died in 1700 at the age of seventeen, busying himself with giving poetic form to the 613 Commandments (*SHIR LE-TARYAG MIZWOT*), the theme of the poets of this period bears a closer relation to life, and its tone is more worldly. Even Gerson Hefez shows in his *YAD HARUZIM* (Venice 1700) which is a dictionary of rimes, a fine appreciation of poetry and poetic forms, and the octave he quotes from his father is elegant and finished. The poetry of this period is, of course, Jewish, and tinged with a religious coloring, but Joseph Carmi of Modena is the only religious poet of his time, and avowedly liturgical. The bulk of the poetry of the seventeenth century is philosophical, didactic, and polemic rather than religious. True poetic feeling is beginning to manifest itself. Not only have form and style made great strides, but two or three true poets appear on the horizon, and infuse into the poetry of the period the breath of life.

Leon de Modena, a pupil of Archevolti (Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.*, I, 383), who marks the period of transition from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century (April 23, 1571-March 27, 1648) is such a peculiar phenomenon, such a combination of strength and weakness, such a contradiction in himself, that he seems to have possessed a dual personality. A rabbinical scholar of great endowment, combining with it a mastery of the Hebrew, Italian, and Latin, he is now a bold skeptic, now a doughty champion of rabbinism, a scoffer at the Kabbalah and a writer of amulets, a member of the rabbinate and a passionate gambler. A preacher, a teacher, a rabbi, a merchant, a money-lender, a marriage-broker, and a cantor, he meets with failure in all his undertakings, ruined by his passion for gambling. A man of marvelous versatility, gifted with a keen power of expression in several languages, he also tried his hand at the only literary efforts that paid in those days—the writing of verses for special occasions. To quote Berliner: "He sang of everything that came his way, preferably when he was paid for it, so that he even immortalized a niggardly customer who failed to pay for an Epitaph."²² He sang in honor of princes, bishops, scholars, men of prominence, authors and their works." But he specialized in wedding odes and epitaphs—occasions which no Italian Jew failed to grace with a poem, written by the interested parties when possible, or made to order by some one else. Most of these occasional poems of Modena's are still in manuscript, but

²² This epitaph was written in honor of Simon Copio, father of the poetess Sarah Copia Sullam who died in 1606. The reference reads:

שלחתי שיר הזה	מעות איני חוזה
ולכל פועל ראוי	לחת את משכורתו.

Berliner, *Luhot Abanim*, 79; Soave in Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, VII, 182.

the collection of epitaphs published by Dr. A. Berliner (LUHOT ABANIM, Frankf. a. M. 1881) which contains a great number of epitaphs, the work of Modena, show his marvelous skill and ingenuity in the making of Hebrew verse. It is not so much what he says, as the way he says it, the clever allusions to biblical and talmudic phrases, the brilliant play on words that betray his remarkable familiarity with Jewish literature, and show a genius of style that strongly suggests Immanuel. While his style is sometimes hopelessly mediæval, his lines are, as a rule, not forced and obscure. His epitaphs are not fulsome and extravagant in praise as one might expect of a professional epitaph-maker but rather modest, expressive of sentiments of sympathy and of the comfort of a heavenly reward. At times he is even tender. The great fertility of the resources of his style, as Dr. Berliner points out, may be seen in the fact that he never repeats himself, and is never at a loss for a new phrase to express the central thought common to all his inscriptions—consolation in the thought of a future life. At times he parodies even the Prayer-Book,²³ but with such ingenuity of new application that one cannot but readily forgive him his invasion of that sacred domain.

Leon Modena began his poetic activity at the age of thirteen by writing an elegy on his teacher Moses Basela (Della Rocca) which may be read both in Hebrew and Italian—the first, according to Reggio, to introduce this species of bilingual poetry which found many imitators in Italy.²⁴ At

²³ See I. Davidson's *Parody in Jewish Literature*, No. 39.

²⁴ This poem is given in *Midbar Yehudah* which also contains two commendatory sonnets, one by Samuel Archevolti, the other by Azariah Figo of Venice (d. 1647). Figo's sonnet is clear and elegant.

fifteen he wrote his own epitaph.²⁵ His collection of homilies MIDBAR JEHUDAH (Venice 1602) contains, in addition to the above, *Kinot* on Rabbis Jacob Cohen (d. 1596), Samuel Judah Katzenelenbogen (d. 1597), and Abigdor Cividali of Venice; and a song in honor of Doctor Eliezer Belgrado, none of which is above mediocrity. But as an imitator and parodist he shows great cleverness. His parody on the *נוגד המצחקים* ascribed to Abraham Ibn Ezra "has the form and spirit of the original but is not as clear and forcible"²⁶; but his sacred parodies, if one may use this expression, are very ingenious. Thus, his epitaph on Grassin Grassini (d. 1616) is splendid:

אשר הלך	אדון נעלם
יציר נברא	בתום עם כל
בחפץ אל	לעת אעשה
שמו נקרא	אזי טבת

²⁵ Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, XI, 210. Modena composed his own epitaph which reads as follows:

ארבע אמות קרקע בחצר זה
אגב קנין סודר מימות עולם
הקנו ממעל ליהודה אריה
ממודינו בזה נסתר נעלם.

Like Azariah dei Rossi, Modena saw a vision in which a prophet announced to him the day of his death; and, in imitation of dei Rossi's quatrain on the same occasion, he wrote:

על משכבי שוהה הש' ע'ז ליל י"ג טבת
חלמתי עם נביא, מודיע לי קצי;
עוד שנים ארבע, וירחים עוד שבעה
תמוז או אב ש' פ' א אגע על רבצי.

which, however, did not come true, since he died in 1648 (S. J. Rapoport in *Kerem Chemed*, V, 159-63).

On Modena see N. S. Libowitz, *Yehudah Aryeh Modena*, New York, 1901 (Hebrew); Introduction to *Zemah David* by J. Druckerman, New York, 1899 (Hebrew); Graetz, IX; and J.E.

²⁶ Davidson, *Parody in Jewish Literature*, 33.

ואחרי כ—	קרות הקול
לרב גרשין	מאד נורא
והוא חיה	והוא הווה
והוא יחיה	בתפארה.

(*Luhot Abanim*, No. 21. The dotted letters give the date, 18 Tebet, 5376).

קדוש נרחץ	תוך מי טוהר
מבין אחים	מוציא מצה
מרור כורך	כל הנשאר
צפון ברך	לאל נרצה.

(*ibid.*, No. 54, last four lines). מוציא מצה = removeth strife. מרור כורך וכו' = all who are left (who survived him) are wrapt in bitterness. צפון ברך וכו' = the hidden one (the dead) is blessed, and acceptable to God.

An ingenious one is also that on Joseph Melli who died (1611) while on a journey:

מארץ מולדתו	יצא יצא יוסף
לשוב עוד לביתו	ולא יכול יוסף
רוגז קפץ אותו	מרוגזו של יוסף
מות מצא אותו	טרופ טרף יוסף.

(*ibid.*, No. 44).

Or this one on the death of Esther Simḥah who died in 1590 on the eve of her wedding:

עלמה תמה	מות דמה
הגיע תור	הסתר אסתר:
יפה כלה	אותה כלה
וי היא בימי	גילת אסתר:

(*ibid.*, No. 83, alluding to Esther 2, 15 and Deut. 31, 18).

The following on Simḥah Servi (d. 1636) proves that the poet can also be deeply pathetic, and contains lines of great lyric beauty:

פתאום ישבה בדר בין החוחים
 חמדת נשים כשושנים סוגה
 הן כעת אחד השיחים
 אשת חיל הרכה והענוגה
 הנה עולם זה כמלון אורחים
 על כן, כי אחרית השמחה תוגה

(No. 63); or:

אשה שנתגרשה מן ים נגרש
 אל חוף כולל בו כל התנחומין

(No. 109). Beautiful is this line, on an infant (the ten months old daughter of the poetess Sarah Copia Sullam):

שחר אשר נעדר בטרם יום.

(No. 158).

Of far greater interest and importance are the brothers Frances, Jacob b. David (1615 at Mantua-1667 at Florence), and Emanuel b. David (July 22, 1618 (?)²⁷-Leghorn after 1703). Men of high rabbinic learning, acquainted with philosophy and secular literature, clear-headed and of a sane and logical turn of mind, they devoted their life to combating the evils of mysticism, credulity, and superstition. The seventeenth century saw the apotheosis of the Kabbalah. Jewish as well as Christian scholars of high attainment, and, otherwise, of a healthy and rational mind, held the Kabbalah in such high esteem that they were carried off their feet, as it were, by its mysteries. While this kabbalistic craze could not affect the Christian

²⁷ Gottheil in *J.E.*; D. Kohn, *אור וחושך*, 5, gives it c. 1625, while Brody in *Metek Sefatayim* (p. 5) as 1630.

scholars very injuriously outside of mental perversion, it wrought incalculable mischief to the Jewish people because it found embodiment in the person of a Messiah. Shabbethai Zebi, himself perhaps a victim of delusion, found thousands of ardent followers in all the lands of Jewish dispersion, and their enthusiasm knew no bounds in the anticipation of a speedy restoration in the Holy Land under the leadership of this God's Anointed. In vain did some few clear-headed rabbis and scholars protest against the insanity of Jews pinning their faith to a self-deluded fanatic and libertine, for such did Shabbethai become under the intoxication of his brief power. Their voices were voices crying in the wilderness. And even when the bubble burst in the *Annus Mirabilis* 1666, and Shabbethai himself embraced Mohammedanism to save his neck, many of his followers still persisted in their perversion, and others, losing heart, sank into all kinds of excesses to forget their disappointment. Shabbethai Zebi came dangerously near wrecking both the Jew and Judaism.

Under such circumstances, the two brothers Jacob and Emanuel must have been men of extraordinary courage to throw down the gauntlet to Shabbethai Zebi and his followers. The fight against the so-called Messiah became their main object in life, their passion; and the weapon they employed was that dangerous instrument—satire. In *ZEBI MUDDAH* (*A Fallen Stag*, in allusion to Shabbethai's name) they hurled all the shafts of ridicule and invective, of sarcasm and indignation, of irony, and mockery, against the impostor and his dupes. Moreover, Jacob Frances, realizing with the instinct of the philosophic thinker that the Kabbalah was the source of all this upheaval had the

hardihood to attack the Kabbalah itself²⁸—the Kabbalah so strongly intrenched in the popular mind that it outranked even the Bible and the Talmud.²⁹ “Happy, indeed, is the people whom God had chosen as the standard-bearer of His Law,” says Jacob in his poem against the Kabbalah, “and happy indeed is the man who is able to penetrate to the depth of its secrets.” But the poet cannot restrain himself from crying out when he sees “asses approaching Mount Moriah,” or when things have reached such a pass that “a man is no man who does not prate about the God-head.” “From every street and market-place the Kabbalah shouts, and even infants in swaddling-cloths are busying themselves with mysteries. Ignoramuses who know nothing about nature and about the earth are absorbed in studying the “Circles of Heaven”; boors who know nothing of the Law are dealing in “secrets,” and libertines and charlatans are indulging in the Zohar.” “Great men,” he says in conclusion, “absorb themselves in metaphysics only after they have acquired a thorough knowledge of other, more practical branches of learning,” and he advises his readers to call the Torah “sister” and philosophy “friend.” Such unheard-of outspokenness and boldness naturally shocked the Kabbalist rabbis of Mantua who, thereupon, ordered every copy of the poem burned, so that only the poet’s copy remained.³⁰ The Venetian rabbis, with Simḥah (Simone)

²⁸ Part of this poem was published in David Kohn’s *Or we-Hoshek* (pp. 7-8) in *Ozar ha-Sifrut*, I, and in *Metek Sefatayim*, 72-73. It was saved from oblivion by Samson Morpurgo of Ancona who published it at the end of *Ez ha-Da’at*, his commentary on Peninni’s *Behinat ‘Olam*, Venice 1704; it is given also in the Introduction to Rapoport’s *Nahalat Yehudah*.

²⁹ D. Kohn, *Or we-Hoshek*, 8; *Metek Sefatayim*, 74.

³⁰ H. Brody in his edition of the *Metek Sefatayim* (p. 74) feels impelled to defend Jacob’s attitude to the Kabbalah by saying that he opposed only the pseudo-Kabbalah while he revered the “true” Kabbalah. David Kohn in *Or we-Hoshek* (p. 6) maintains, on the other hand, that Jacob

Luzzatto at their head, boldly stood by the side of Jacob Frances, and the fight spread all over Italy. The followers of the Turkish Messiah retaliated by denouncing Jacob as a heretic, attacked his house, and even made an attempt on his life. Nor did his brother Emanuel, who stood so nobly by him, escape persecution. He, like his brother, was compelled to leave his native city, wandered from place to place, even to Algiers, settling finally at Leghorn. And, when Jacob died in 1667 in the midst of the struggle, Emanuel continued the fight, and carried on the defense of his dead brother.

The ZEBI MUDDAH of the brothers Frances is unique in the Hebrew literature. Immanuel the Roman is humorous rather than sarcastic; Kalonymos b. Kalonymos, while bitter at times, is prompted by love rather than by hate, and love covers a multitude of sins; Menahem de Lonzano is

abhorred the Kabbalah as such, saying: "A Kabbalist is a fool. Jacob questioned the sanctity of the Zohar publicly and told every one that Simon b. Yoḥai was not its author." It seems to me that Kohn is right. From Emanuel's defense of his dead brother *ויכוח לבני ושמעני* (pp. 11-12), it is quite evident that Jacob had no regard for the Kabbalah as such. He believed in the *סתרי תורה* which is entirely distinct from mysticism though also designated Kabbalah. The date of the composition of the poem is also uncertain. Kohn seems to think it was written before "ZEBI MUDDAH" (p. 9), Brody that it was written after (p. 72). It was published originally on a page by itself with no date and place. From the fact that the Mantua rabbis were able to confiscate it, it may be inferred that it was first published at Mantua.

The Kabbalah took a deep hold upon the Jews of Italy almost from the time of the appearance of the Zohar, and became so strong that very few had the hardihood to say aught against it. Even Leon de Modena, himself an anti-Kabbalist and not at all a hypocrite, found it necessary to simulate his belief in mysticism as he confesses to his disciple David Finzi of Egypt: "If any one else asked me concerning this matter (the belief in metempsychosis), I would put him off with words or answer in the affirmative (with due mental reservation), since any one who differs from the mob (*hamon*) is called either a fool or a heretic." To his disciple, however, he affirmed his non-belief in such superstition. See D. Kohn, *Or we-Hoshek*, p. 5; Graetz, X, 131.

prompted by zeal. ZEBI MUDDAH, however, is inspired by hate, and is venomous to the extreme.

“My quill is charged with fire,
My pen point is a dart;
My tongue a poisoned arrow,
To strike him to the heart,”

exclaims Jacob Frances (p. 103), and this is the keynote of the two parts of the poem. Many of the epithets the brothers employ are far from refined, and some would be considered obscene to-day. In extenuation, however, one must take into consideration the freedom of expression characteristic of the Italian literature of that period; and, above all, the necessity of applying heroic measures to cure the universal madness. Jacob anticipated the fate that would befall the “*Stag*,” and he would gladly have laughed at his ruin were it not that he feared for his people, whose faith in the impostor would finally “pile up destruction upon destruction, exile upon exile, affliction upon affliction” (p. 105). He denounces his persecutors who destroyed his home, and calls down dire vengeance upon their heads. He rails at the disciples of Shabbethai who are disregarding rabbinical laws and Jewish customs at the instigation of the new prophet (p. 115); and Emanuel denounces Shabbethai himself for his licentiousness (p. 123).³¹ At times, in a tenderer mood, the poets plead with the people to realize

³¹ He attacks a certain Hosea of Alexandria, one of Shabbethai's prophets, in this wise:

מה קול חמור נוער באזני אשמעה, הן באמת זה קולך הושע?
מי את אשר תשאג ותנהום כארי, אם כזבוב תדמה וצפרדע?
בור ריק הלא אתה ואיך תחשב היות נחל מקור חכמה ובין נובע?
הולך עלי גחון ואמר לבך כי בעננים ראשך נגיע.

(Zebi Muddah, p. 124).

their folly and to return to their senses; at times they offer up prayers to God to forgive their people's lack of faith in Him, and have pity on them. At other times the brothers call upon each other to remain steadfast in their fight, and encourage each other with the hope that the day will yet come when their work in behalf of their people will be fully appreciated. Thus, Jacob:

שירי ראויים לחקוק על יהלום, אף כי לזכר על נֶיֶר יודפסו,
 עוד יצאו ללקוט אבל לא ימצאו מְלִי אשר היום בטיט רמסו.

(p. 115); and Emanuel:

הה! כי דבר כזב ושוא שנאתי
 על כן יחידתי בכפי שמתני,
 אם הפתאים יאהבו פתי
 מאז לעומתם עֲדָנָה קמתי;
 פני כחלמיש עלי זאת שְׁתִּי
 ולמורטים על זאת לחיי תתי.

(p. 127).

The poems constituting ZEBI MUDDAH, in clear, free almost rabbinic Hebrew, and in bold and vigorous figures, with a wealth of ingenious allusions, written mostly in monorime, are impressive, and strike home with telling effect. The sonnets interspersed here and there add the necessary element of variety to keep the poems from becoming monotonous. On the whole, ZEBI MUDDAH, by its naturalness, vigor, sincerity, and life-interest, stands in the midst of the colorless verse of that period like an oasis in a wilderness—refreshing and invigorating.

The same tone of vindictiveness, scorn, and bitterness that characterized the ZEBI MUDDAH rings also through the WIKKUAH LIBNI WE-SHIMEI,³² compiled by Emanuel, and

³² Published for the first time by H. Brody in Fuchs's החוקר, I; reprinted in pamphlet form, Cracow 1893.

written in the same vigorous diction and style. Composed in 1667 in Florence, in the form of a dialogue, it is an attack, fierce and violent, against the traducers of the memory of his brother Jacob, and is an ardent defense of his dead brother's attitude towards the Kabbalah. The dialogue is written in rimed prose, but contains one sonnet (p. 6), 3 octaves (p. 7), and 18 sestets (pp. 7-9; unfinished) of Jacob's, and four sonnets by Emanuel. Jacob's poems are vindictive utterances against his enemies. Full of bitterness against them, he uses his powerful pen to avenge himself upon them to the full. Keenly he feels the shameful attacks and the insults hurled at him:

מה אומרה? שיווי היש או ערך
לכאב לבבי מחלת הרוח?
אלאה נשוא עולם עבודת פרך
עד מה עליהם אדכאה אשות!

(p. 7). He was happy in his quiet home, he complains in his fifth sestet (p. 8); but his foes came, destroyed his home and his peace, while he was powerless to defend himself. He therefore turns to heaven for vengeance, and heaps imprecations upon the heads of his persecutors:

העת, המון שירי, לשבתך בית?
קרא לכל הָרִי מנשאי חרב
הכות בלי השאיר כנקף זית
חיל מעַנִּי כדמות זאבי ערב
עד היסוד עצמות מעני ערו,
אכלו בשרם דם שתו ושכרו!

(*ibid.*, p. 8; for הָרִי cf. Ezek. 38, 21). As for himself he will never submit or give up the fight:

מצחי כשמיר עז תהי הפעם
אראה אנוש גאה ואשפילהו;

יסבול גבה לב כבדות זעם
 מני, יכלכל כאויל מחלהו.
 לבני מרי אחיה לאיש מוכיח
 אשום לים מרים גבול וברית.

(*ibid.*).

And this is Emanuel's parting shot at his brother's enemies:

אוצו כלבים זועקים לנבוח
 הב! צעקו, הב, הב לשירך טעם;
 אך יש בפי חץ — אם בפיהם רעם
 אדע נשור אם תדעו לצרות.

"O haste, ye dogs, aloud that bark,
 That shout: 'Bow-wow, your song is trite';
 They can but thunder—I can shoot;
 They can but bark—while I can bite."

(p. 12).

The two brothers resembling each other so much in their mode of thought and in temperament, resemble each other in style also. Jacob's influence over his brother and pupil seems to be overmastering, and both are children of their age and generation. The mediæval and the modern seem to struggle for supremacy, and now the one and now the other tendency triumphs. In ZEBI MUDDAH the mediæval tone, both in rime and in mode of expression, is somewhat relieved by the passion, the all-absorbing seriousness, and the sincerity that impelled the brother-poets. In other poems, however, where such passion is absent, both poets relapse occasionally into hopeless mediævalism. Thus, Jacob's elegy on Shemaiah da Modena (מתק שפתים, 91-94) is replete with the ingenious puns, homonyms, and allit-

erations that are the joy of the mediæval poets, but which are labored and obscure :

צורי! מאד צר לי, לצירי אין צירי
גם שאגותי יתכו כמים:
מר לי למר מורי, צרור המור, ולו
אוחיל כיולדה עלי אבנים.

(p. 92) ;

נערר הדר הדור, ודדר דר בכל
לבב, ודמעת דם בכל עינים

(p. 93). The same is true of his elegy on Azariah Figo, Leon da Modena, Samuel Masead, and Elijah. Though clearer and more forcible than the elegy on Shemaiah da Modena, it is just as mediæval. Here he even goes to the extent of dividing a word at the end of a line for the sake of the meter against which Archevolti protested so strongly; and lines like:

אראה אשר אלוף לאלוף, שר לשור,
משכיל למסכיל, בר לבור נכנעו,

(מתק שפתים, 97), sufficiently attest the hold Spanish-Arabic influences still have on him. This is likewise true of Emanuel who composed a poem consisting wholly of proper names (*ibid.*, 58-9), in his elegy on his father where the echo responds at the end of each verse, a device employed also by Zacuto; and in many other lines with which he illustrates his treatise on prosody, METEK SEFATAYIM. On the other hand, when they use modern Italian forms of versification, they become modern also in expression and thought with hardly a trace of mediævalism. The form of verse they employ seems to transform them into children of that period also in thought and style. Thus, Jacob's elegy on Rabbi Menahem Cases (died 1648),

a canzone, is a veritable lyric gem. The poet, overcome by his sorrow at the death of so great a master, addresses himself to all nature; to earth, to cease yielding its fragrance in verdure and bloom, to the heavens, to turn black with darkness, and to the sun, to refuse to shed his rays and warmth, for,

מה זה ואיך חֲמָה עדן תזריח
 ישחק למולי שֶׁחַק
 חלד יבול יצמיח
 ויחשוב עניי לדק ושחק?
 הה! כי עלי תלי הריסותינו
 יבנו ברוב עֲזָמו
 בנין שמחות למו
 וימצאו הון באבדתינו.

(מתק שפתים, 101). How many such lines are found in the works of his contemporaries? And what tenderness pervades the following octave:

סורה אדוני אל מנוחֶתך
 שם מתלאות הזמן תרגיע
 הנה לפניך ולקראתך
 עולים ויורדים מלאכי רקיע
 שלום לך שלום בביאתך
 מָזָה ומָזָה, זה וזה יביע.
 תקיץ ותציץ כאשר יציצו
 כל שוכני עפר ביום יקיצו.

(*Kol 'Ugab*, p. 59b).

This feeling of tenderness that pervades many of Jacob's poems is stronger still and deeper in Emanuel, for misfortune has marked him for her own. His father died

in 1651; his first wife Hannah Grazia in 1652, and their two children David and Esther soon followed. His second wife Miriam Visiani whom he married in 1656 died in 1663, and their only son Issachar in 1664 at the age of seventeen months. To crown his misery, his older brother and teacher Jacob whom he loved most tenderly died in 1667. His fight against Shabbethai Zebi had cost him the friends of his youth who had forsaken him through all his troubles on account of his unpopularity with the followers of the Kabbalah. Thus, in his thirties, he remained lonely and friendless, feeling that his life in the future held out no hope and no cheer. Thus he laments:

שכול ואלמון פעמים אלכה, על כן ברמה כנהי שניתי

 מי זה למשענתי בזקנתי יהי, מי זה לעדני אחרי בלותי,
 מי זה יעצים עיני ועלי יאבל, אם לא בני זה כאשר אויתי

 מה לו לאיוב כי יקלל יום אשר נולד ומה ראה ולא ראיתי?

(Elegy on second wife; ממזרח וממערב, No. 3, 77).⁸³ And it is indeed in Job-like lamentations that the three elegies on his wives and children are written. They are heart-rending cries of woe and despair. Carried away by his sorrow and grief, the poet gives vent to his feelings; and his lines, like waves of a stormy ocean, rush on impetuous, turbulent, and violent. In his sonnet and elegy on his brother, he consoles himself with the thought that fate cannot possibly hold out any more misfortunes for him, since the loss of his brother was the greatest possible blow that could strike him:

⁸³ Published by David Kaufmann, with introduction, pp. 69-78.

אשוב ללבי זאת והתנחמתי:
 כי אם בחסר כל נשארתי
 לא יאמרו לי זאת ועוד אחרת.

(מתק שפתים, p. 79). In another sonnet he comforts himself with the thought that even he would die some day ;

אל תחמי נפשי ואל תשתוחחי
 כי גם בצרותי שנותי עוברות:
 כי איש מעונה לא לעולמים יחי.

(*ibid.*, p. 86) ; and how pathetic are the lines :

נטו ימי בחרות ופנו עורף
 גז חיש כציץ ימלו
 כלו בעשן כלו
 וסתיו ימי חיי ועת החורף
 ישבית בגז עדני פרי ופרח
 ובשערי ימטיר כפור וקרח.

(*Kol 'Ugab*, p. 59a).

Happily, Emanuel does not succumb to these moods, but rises superior to them. As seen from the ZEBI MUDDAH, the brothers are satirists above all ; but their shafts were not exhausted on Shabbethai Zebi. Woman is a favorite topic with them. Thus, Jacob :

"On three occasions, only three,
 A woman's movements should be free :
 The first at birth, and then when she
 Is led beneath the canopy.
 The third and last—and this the best—
 When she is led to her final rest."

(*Kol 'Ugab*, No. 15). Again, in a sonnet (*ibid.*, No. 38), he ridicules a man for mourning after his dead wife. "My

wife lives on forever, defying age and time, *on account of my sins.*" In fact, the two brothers wrote a dialogue ויכוח on woman,³⁴ one quotation from which will suffice to indicate the tenor of the whole:

גַּל זֶה לְמִשָּׁא וְלֹא לְמַצְבָּה
שְׁמִתִּי לְאִשְׁתִּי עַל קְבוּרָתָהּ
פֶּן חֵם וְשִׁלּוּם אַחֲרֵי מוֹתָהּ
תְּקוּם, וְאֵל בֵּיתִי תִּהְיֶה שׁוֹבָה (שְׁבָה?).

In another, more serious, poem Jacob satirizes the power of gold:

כִּמָּה נִסִּיכִי עִם בַּעַת יִשְׁכְּבוּ
עַל כֶּסֶם זָהָבָם נִלְכְּדוּ בַּפַּחַת,
כִּמָּה בַּמַּטּוֹת פֹּז בַּעַת יִשְׁכְּבוּ
בִּלְתִּי יְקוּמוּן, יִרְדּוּ לַשַּׁחַת.
.....
כִּמָּה בְּכֵלִי זָהָב וְלֹא בַּחֲרָם
כִּמָּה וּכְמָה יִמְצְאוּ הָאָרֶם.
יְהִי, כִּי לִשּׁוֹן זָהָב וְאֵם אֵלֶמֶת
תִּהְיֶה כָּל לִשּׁוֹן וְאֵם נוֹאֲמֶת.

(*Kol 'Ugab*, p. 58a).

Emanuel also is able to write in a similar strain, though he is humorous rather than sarcastic. To a young man who asked him to compose an octave without assigning a subject, he replies:

"An octave, now, is your request?
Then bring me pen and ink, my son!
But while of rime I am in quest
Behold the half already done!
And, if God wills it, all the rest

³⁴ Quoted by Brody in *Metek Sefatayim*, p. 17. I do not know whether this dialogue has as yet been published in its entirety.

Will likewise written be anon.

But two lines more? An easy task,

And here is the octave which you ask."

In a similar strain, his epigrams are very clever:

"The poor who begs with bated breath,

And asks for alms with tearful eyes

Is surely not afraid of death:

Who begs, a thousand times he dies."

(*ibid.*, No. 47);

"That speech alone distinguishes

The brute from man is wrong:

Else, why did God upon the fool

Bestow a speaking tongue?"

(*ibid.*, No. 48).

The following are examples of his mock-epitaphs
(מתק שפתים, 24-6):

On Democritus:

מעניך דמעה תהי מוחק

קורא, ותצחק על קבורתי

כי כן אני גם אחרי מותי

לו יש לאל ידי, אהי שוחק.

On Heracleitus:

כלו (ב)חיי בדמעות, כלו

עיני, עדי בואי בגיא צלמות,

גם פה אבכה אחרי המות

אך שערי דמעה, אהה, ננעלו.

On a fool:

אדם שוטח נקבר בזה.

מעל קברו, קורא, תשטה;

ודעה כי גם אחרי מותו

טוב התרחק מאיש שוטח.

On a tale-bearer :

בקבורה זאת אדם נבזה
הולך רכיל, מוציא דבה
גם אם יוכל יטיל איבה
בין המתים היום הזה.

But Emanuel can also be graceful, as is shown by the sonnet addressed to his teacher Joseph Fermo, rabbi of Ancona :

"If upon the heaven's face
The moon at night in bright array
'Midst starry hosts doth hold her sway
And brilliant shines in gentle grace,
Her light, illumining all space,
Is stolen from the Lord of Day;
Is but the sun's reflected ray,
When he and she meet face to face.

Thus, when I taught in public ear
The sacred Law, O teacher mine!
And people hearkened far and near,
Not mine the light I shed but thine.
Thy reflex did *me* glorify:
Thou art the sun, the moon am I."

(*Kol 'Ugab*, No. 4).

In his younger days Emanuel was guilty even of writing love poems. He abhorred the sensual and the obscene in any language and especially in Hebrew. For this reason he condemned Immanuel the Roman; "but a poet need not depart from decency, and he is not to be blamed for praising his wife or his betrothed or an unmarried woman whom he intends to marry" (מתק שפתים, p. 47-48). Accord-

ingly he had no scruples in singing the charms of his betrothed Hannah Grazia, in a beautiful sonnet, and of other women in lines which are not always so pure in tone and expression. Later on, however, he became conscience-stricken that he had permitted himself to sing "songs of evil" in honor of artificially made-up women:

שֶׁר אֲשֶׁר הוֹזֵהב לְעֵין הַחֶרֶם
מִצַּח אֲשֶׁר נִמְרָט בְּמִלְקָחִים
פָּנִים מְלוּטָשִׁים בְּטוֹחַ אֶרֶם —

הֵיוּ בְּעֵינֵינוּ זֶהב פְּרוּיִם
זֶהר לְבָנָה מֵרַחְבֵי רִקִּיעַ,
שְׁנֵי מְעוֹרָב עִם כְּפֹר שָׁמַיִם!

(*ibid.*, p. 84), and he recants. He takes a vow never to write such poems again, but to devote himself to didactic poems exclusively—a resolve to which he remained faithful.

An elegant verse-builder, but without originality and without poetic power whatever, is Abraham b. Shabbethai Cohen, rabbinical scholar and physician (1670-1729). Born in Crete the year after the island was wrested from the Republic of Venice by Turkey, and removing afterwards to Zante, Abraham Cohen received his education in Ancona under Manoah Vita Provençale, and his work KEHUNNAT ABRAHAM (*Priesthood of Abraham*) was very likely written there, though it was not published till 1719 (Venice). KEHUNNAT ABRAHAM is a rimed paraphrase of the Psalms. Each verse of each psalm is paraphrased in a separate stanza, the poet preserving the same stanzaic structure throughout the given psalm, but employing varying forms of versification for the different psalms. In addition, the contents of each psalm are given in a doubly rimed couplet at the beginning of each paraphrase proper; while at the

end of each book, the opening lines of each paraphrased psalm are combined into a metric monorime. The book is introduced by the highly enthusiastic panegyrics of various rabbis. Joseph Fiammeta (not Piatita as given by Delitzsch), rabbi of Ancona, extolls the poem in eight well written octaves; Isaac Vita Cantarini (Feb. 2, 1644-June 8, 1723), and Shabbethai Marini (died 1740), both rabbis and physicians of Padua, sing sonnets in his honor, as do also Isaac b. Asher Pacifico (Shalom), Mordecai Ferrarese, and Jacob Aboab. The poet replies to each not only in the same stanzaic structure he employed, but even in the same rime words. Abraham Cohen paraphrased the *PIRKE SHIRAH* also.

In spite of the encomiums of his contemporaries and of Delitzsch, the work of Abraham Cohen is not a masterpiece. He certainly enriched Hebrew poetry with a wealth of Italian stanzas hitherto unemployed by Italian Hebrew poets; and his diction is purely biblical throughout, in accordance with his own protest against the employment of talmudic and Aramaic words in Hebrew poetry, and in striking contrast with his own highly artificial and mixed prose. But the diffuseness of each stanza destroys its beauty. The vigor of biblical poetry is due, to a great extent, to its conciseness. Prophets and psalmist used but few words; each word represents a thought and an idea. Nothing is superfluous. Biblical poetry contains a multiplicity of imagery in a paucity of words. Abraham Cohen did not appreciate this fact. Compelled by his own choice to represent each verse by a stanza, he is prolix and verbose. As a consequence, all the beauty and sublimity of the psalm are destroyed. While Abraham Cohen succeeds in reproducing the thought of the Psalms, he does not succeed in reproducing their spirit.

The last and perhaps the most characteristic poet of the seventeenth century as well as of the entire semi-mediæval period is Moses Zacuto (about 1625-Oct. 1, 1697, at Mantua). Born in Amsterdam, a descendant of a famous Portuguese family, he received a splendid education both secular and rabbinic, the latter at the "Midrash Ez ha-Hayyim," the Jewish college of Amsterdam, and thus was a schoolmate of Benedict Spinoza. Unlike his illustrious schoolmate, he showed a marked tendency towards mysticism from his earliest youth, and his eagerness to be initiated into the Kabbalah led him to Posen to study under Sheftel, the son of Isaiah Hurwitz. In 1645 he left Poland for Verona, then came to Venice, whence he intended sailing for the Holy land. He was, however, dissuaded from his purpose, and was elected to the Venetian rabbinate. In 1673 he was called to the rabbinate of Mantua which position he occupied to his death. While Zacuto led an active literary life and filled his office with dignity, he was a kabbalist first and foremost, and even an ardent adherent of Shabbethai Zebi. His tendency towards fanaticism is best illustrated by the anecdote told of him to the effect that he fasted forty days in order to forget his Latin because a knowledge of that profane tongue was to him incompatible with kabbalistic inspiration!

An ardent soul, a dreamer of dreams, and a seer of visions, Zacuto evinced a poetic talent from his early youth. Nurtured at the breast of the Kabbalah, itself a product of the imagination run riot, his poetic energy was frittered away on the search after the mystic and the mysterious which excites but does not inspire the mind. Whatever enthusiasm he possessed was devoted to the Kabbalah, and his poems, in consequence, lack inspiration and emotion. Only his religious poems of which he wrote forty-seven

show spontaneity and traces of lyric beauty. Still, Zacuto was a poet; and his two longer poems deserve special consideration, the one because it is the first of its kind in Hebrew literature, the second because it is so characteristic of the age.

YESOD 'OLAM (*The Foundation of the World*) written by Zacuto in his youth, is the first dramatic poem in the Hebrew language. Why the drama did not flourish among Jews is easily understood. The Greek and Roman drama, originally of a religious nature and accompanied by Dionysiac orgies, the Hebrews despised as a species of idolatrous worship which it was. During the Middle Ages when Jewish existence was so precarious, though the theater had been purified under Christian influences and was really biblical in its nature, Jewish dramatic performances were out of the question. Moreover, the insults heaped upon the Jews by the clowns and comedians of the stage, and the humiliation they were exposed to, especially during carnival days in Rome, did not tend to diminish the hatred of the Jew toward theatrical performances. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century, with the development of the drama into the miracle play, Jewish prejudice against the stage gradually disappeared. In fact, we find a species of drama and dramatic performances in the Jewish Purim plays. However, as the drama usually flourishes in times of great national prosperity and success, no true Hebrew drama could reasonably have come into existence before the seventeenth century and anywhere else outside of Holland. Here the Jews were treated with all kindness and consideration; Holland was victorious, in the height of her glory and prosperity, and her own national drama reached the zenith, of its development in Joosd van Vondel, the Dutch Shakespeare. Under such circumstances it was

natural for a talented youth like Zacuto, eager for poetic expression, to try his hand at dramatic composition.

As biblical plays were then in vogue, and as a Jewish poet in particular would feel more at home in a biblical environment than anywhere else, Zacuto selected a biblical hero for the purpose of dramatization—and what nobler character could serve his purpose better than that of Abraham? Traditionally the founder not only of the Jewish race but of the Jewish faith as well; a man kind, generous, hospitable, an enthusiast ready and willing to sacrifice both his own life and that of his son for the love of his God, Abraham is, indeed, the type of the Jewish hero. With the example of martyred Marannos fresh in his mind, the horrible crackling of their bones at the *autos-da-fé* still ringing in his ears, the poet might have hoped to present to his suffering brethern the archetype of Jewish heroism that, like a burning bush, is burned again and again but is not consumed, since there is a special Providence watching over him. How did the dramatist utilize his opportunity? The plot will tell:

“Abraham, a philosopher and monotheist, destroyed all the idols he found at the house of his father, Terah. Terah, grieved and incensed at the atrocious sacrilege perpetrated by his son, complains to Nimrod, the king and judge, and asks him to bring his heretic son to reason. Nimrod summons Abraham to appear before his tribunal which Abraham does and is charged with heresy. Abraham boldly declares his belief in one God, argues with Nimrod’s counsellors and sages, and ridicules their idols. Nimrod finally passed the death sentence on Abraham who is carried away to be thrown into the burning furnace.

“Haran, Abraham’s brother, undetermined whether to declare himself a follower of Abraham or of Nimrod, de-

cides to await the result of Abraham's punishment. The king's officers rush in and tell of Abraham's miraculous escape in that the fire refused to consume him. Haran declares his faith in Abraham's God, and Nimrod orders him thrown into the furnace. Soon Abraham appears, followed by the awe-stricken populace, and harangues them upon the power of God, and admonishes them to forsake their idols. Terah and his household, Lot, Sarah, Abraham's niece, and Milkah, Nahor's wife, worship Abraham's God, while Nahor, Abraham's brother, persists in his idolatry."

Such is the plot of the YESOD 'OLAM, the first Hebrew drama, as elaborated from the Midrash (Ber. Rab. c. 38, section 19). As a drama, it must be stated at once, it is a complete failure. The poet had neither the technical skill nor the artistic conception of the true dramatist. The monologues and dialogues are too long, too elaborate, and entirely out of proportion. There is little dramatic action, and songs are introduced promiscuously. The form of rime used, mostly quatrains, and a great many sonnets, is ill-suited to the purpose of the dialogue. If the poet's motive in the composition of the drama was to call upon his people to remain steadfast in their faith, this appeal is put in the closing lines of the drama in the mouth not of Abraham, but of the idolater Nahor—and this destroys the effect. The drama, as a whole, degenerates into a theological disputation. Still as a dramatic poem and as the work of a mere youth, it is a work of promise.

Abraham is a character worthy of the patriarch, a truly heroic figure, a thinker, a philosopher, an orator who defies all soothsayers and magicians, and sways the populace at will; a hero who scorns the despot Nimrod and looks death boldly in the face; a faithful servant of God,

and a zealous missionary. In strong antithesis is placed Nimrod, the type of an Oriental despot, a self-complacent tyrant, regarding himself as a deity, exacting divine obedience and honors from his servants. The conflict going on between the prophet and the tyrant, the man of God and the man of the sword, the zealous missionary and the mighty hunter, is strongly emphasized throughout the poem. The diction of the poem is pure, biblical, and poetic; the phrases are well chosen and free from servile imitation of the Bible; though three Aramaic phrases are employed for the sake of the rime. The sentiments of the poem are lofty and noble, and the tone as well as style of the prayers is especially elevated. Taking it all in all, the YESOD 'OLAM is a worthy achievement, and justly regarded as a landmark in the history of Hebrew poetry.

Judging from the long list of *dramatis personae* given at the beginning of the drama which do not appear in the drama itself, it is probable that the YESOD 'OLAM, as we have it, is only the first act of a drama which the poet intended to extend to greater proportions. Why he did not carry out his design, must, of course, remain a matter of conjecture. This is also true of the motives which led the poet to the composition of this drama. Dr. A. Berliner, the editor of YESOD 'OLAM (1874), maintains, in his learned introduction, that Zacuto who, in all probability, wrote his drama for Purim evening entertainments, wished to hold up to his generation a noble example of self-sacrifice for the glory of God in the person of Abraham. Mr. Israel Abrahams, argues, on the other hand, that Zacuto wished to promulgate the universalistic *mission of Israel*; for, had he intended to hold up an example of readiness to die for Israel's faith, why did he not take Daniel as his

hero?³⁵ Most probably, however, Zacuto had no ulterior motive at all. Like the Latin dramas of the Italian scholars, this Hebrew drama was written by a scholar for scholars, and not for the public; was written merely to satisfy a desire for self-expression, and to prove an ability to handle a dead language. Moreover, while Latin plays were sometimes produced in the presence of Latin scholars, there is no record to show that plays in Hebrew had ever been produced even on Purim. Again, had Zacuto intended to exemplify Abraham's self-sacrifice for the emulation of the Marannos, he would not have written in Hebrew which was to them a sealed book. Nor is it conceivable that Zacuto, the mystic and kabbalist, would have dreamed of teaching a universalistic mission of Israel. The fact that Zacuto did not publish his drama would show conclusively that he looked upon it as a work of youthful amusement, unimportant, insignificant. Whether the poem was written in Amsterdam or in Italy is not stated. The prevailing form of versification and the frequent use of the sonnet show its Italian influences clearly enough.

Entirely different in character as well as in style and expression is Zacuto's *magnum opus* TOFTEH 'ARUK (*Hell Prepared*). Written at a mature age, and under the influences of the Kabbalah which had mastered him completely, Zacuto undertook to describe the punishment and tortures meted out to sinners after death. While all works of this character are necessarily influenced by Dante's *Inferno*, Zacuto's "Hell" is not a mere imitation of Dante. He does not, indeed, reach the sublimity of Dante, and does not possess his sweep of imagination; nor is his poem as elaborate or worked out with the mathematical detail and

³⁵ See the chapter on the Purim-Play and the Hebrew Drama in his *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*.

exactness which makes Dante's *Inferno* so vivid and impressive. Still, Zacuto's presentation is none the less real and positive. Zacuto embodied in this poem the Jewish conception of hell as elaborated during the Middle Ages, and as emphasized by the Kabbalah. Zacuto, therefore, did for the mediæval Jewish conception of Hell what Dante had done for the Christian conception of it—stereotyped it, gave it permanent literary form.

TOFTEH 'ARUK opens with the soliloquy of the dead sinner who does not yet realize the fact of his death. The strange sensation of actual death leaves him dazed, but conscious. He begins by railing against the physicians whose business it is to kill rather than to heal; wondering, with grim humor, why criminals condemned to death are not turned over to physicians for treatment rather than to the executioner, since the result is inevitably the same. He complains bitterly against his friends, his wife and children who have forsaken him, leaving him to his fate, and calls upon death for relief (stanzas 1-26). All of a sudden he beholds a frightful scene: a valley full of caves and crevices seething with sulphuric fires, emitting terrible fumes, the ground covered with burning pitch in which miserable wretches are sunk up to the neck. The fences or walls surrounding the valley are ovens of flames, hissing and blazing fires, fanned by hurrrricanes. Near by, on the other hand, he sees frozen lakes surrounded by hills of eternal snow and ice. Trembling with fear, he looks about him and beholds gigantic figures, "tall as the masts of a ship," with horns on their foreheads, their bodies entirely covered with eyes. These monsters were the demons whose business it was to torment the doomed souls with all manner of indescribable torture. One of these monsters finally approaches the new arrival, and his agony begins (stanzas

27-51). The dead sinner presents a bold front, and demands to know where he is and why he is thus punished. He offers to bribe his tormentor with all the earthly wealth he possessed while in life. To each of his questions and entreaties the devil replies mockingly with but a single word, an echo of the sinner's own word (stanzas 52-69). Finally (stanzas 70-134) the devil begins his explanation. He reads a long list of crimes and sins committed by his victim while on earth. In language ingenious but ambiguous, homonymic and mystifying, evidently intended to bewilder his listener, he tauntingly compares the change in the latter's condition since yesterday, the day of his death, and goes into a description of the seven chambers of Gehenna (the *שבעה מדורי גיהנם* of the Talmud; stanzas 135-177). The first, a pit full of hissing snakes is intended for blasphemers and hypocrites; the second, a fiery chamber wherein are punished magicians, dishonest public officials, the immoral and licentious, and *those who failed to attend divine worship*; the third, wherein are tortured scoffers, usurers, false friends, irreverent worshipers, and those who contemptuously refuse to *respond the Amens to public prayers*; the fourth, in which the sinners sink in dung and refuse, is kept for the haughty rich, the selfish, bribers, bribe-takers, and procurers; the fifth in which the doomed are cut to pieces by hordes of devils with flaming swords is the abode of the mischief-makers, the quarrelsome, the niggards, and uncharitable; the sixth is intended for the self-indulgent and the vain; in the seventh and lowest, adulterers and rebels against God are boiled in red hot caldrons. While those who are doomed in the first six chambers are allowed to rest on the sabbath and holidays, those in the seventh chamber are never given surcease from their torture. The devil winds up (stanzas 178-185) with

a brief description of the seven departments of Paradise wherein the just, crowned in glory, bask in the eternal sunshine of God's presence; and who, beholding the torments of the wicked, justify God's judgment, and bless Him for their own happy life.

Shocking as the conception of the poem may seem to us of to-day, in the seventeenth century such beliefs were common; and, to the mind saturated with the mysteries of the Kabbalah, all too real. At any rate, the sincerity of the poet is beyond question. To him there is no distinction between moral criminals and sinners against the ritual and ceremonial: those who refuse to respond the Amen are classed in the category of scoffers and usurers, and those who fail to attend divine worship are classed with the licentious. And this is indeed the mediæval conception of religion; since each commandment and practice is regarded as equally holy and binding.

In style and diction *TOFTEH 'ARUK* is different from the *YESOD 'OLAM* in that the diction is not always biblical but mixed with Aramaisms, and the style is more complex, artificial, homonymic, involved. Perhaps, as suggested above, the poet's intention was to make the devil's speech correspond to his character. In the devil's rôle as tormentor it was fit for him to use words which would confuse the mind of his questioner who was eager to have his anxiety allayed. In this respect, the style of the *TOFTEH 'ARUK* is a survival of mediævalism, though the versification is modern and Italian. On the whole, as a didactic poem, it is vigorous, and a vivid presentation of a popular belief, and is worthy of an honorable place in the literature of that class. Immanuel's "*Hell*," vague and mild, is written in rimed prose; and Rieti, the first to give the subject an avowedly poetic form, failed completely in his attempt,

because he lacked the imagination necessary to vivify such a topic. At any rate, if any Italian Hebrew poet deserves the honorable appellation of the Hebrew Dante, it is Moses Zacuto.

As Zacuto's longer poems show two distinct tendencies in style and expression, the one clear, forcible, simple, the other obscure and enigmatic, difficult, so do his minor poems also. Of these, the elegy on the death of his teacher Saul Morteira of Amsterdam (1670)³⁶ is written in the style of TOFTEH 'ARUK, and compares with it in ambiguity, artificiality, and unintelligibility. It consists of seven sonnets, each one ending, in a slightly modified form, with the refrain בנות ישראל אל דוד בכינה from David's lament over Saul (II Sam. I, 24). In an introduction consisting of three paragraphs he explains the cause of his grief: a sun rivaling the luminary of heaven, the sun of charity, of sacred eloquence, of Hebrew poetry, of the rabbinate, of jurisprudence, of dialectics and of polemics, . . . and the poem proper is an elaboration of the aspect of each activity. The poet calls upon all the sciences to join him in bewailing the dead master who was an embodiment of all the sciences and all the virtues. The Levites of the sanctuary weep for their brother Levite with whom all sweetness and song have ceased. As he appears before the throne of Divine Majesty to receive his recompense, the celestial beings are dumb (מלים עצרו אילים נגדו כאלים) with admiration at the greatness of one who was an educator of the young, a defender of the faith, a victorious combatant of heresy, and a fiery orator whom none could equal in his skill of utilizing biblical texts for homi-

³⁶ Published by D. Kaufmann in the *REJ.*, XXXVII, 115-19, under the caption of "L'Élégie de Mose Zacuto." On Zacuto see A. Kahana, לההסטוריה באיטליה in *Ha-Goren*, III, 175-180.

letic purposes. "It is impossible," says Kaufmann,³⁷ "to put in their true light, outside of writing a commentary, the numerous allusions which, for the most part, are based upon the Sephardic pronunciation of the Hebrew, the references to Torah and prophets, the use made of scientific terminology, and the play of words which one meets with in this poem." In this instance Zacuto certainly followed to the letter the principle laid down by Emanuel Frances that obscurity is a great poetic virtue.³⁸ His religious poems (HEN KOL ḤADASH, Amsterdam 1712), on the other hand, are much clearer, more intelligible, and display, at times, deep lyric emotions. Zacuto was not capable of sustained effort in his longer poems; but he was a poet nevertheless. His influence on the subsequent development of Italian Hebrew poetry may be seen not only in his imitators, but even in the greatest poet of the eighteenth century, Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto.

(To be continued)

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.

³⁸ דע שדרך משוררים לברוח מדברים קלים ולבקש קשי ההשגה (מתק שפתים) והיא היא תפארתם (p. 42).

MR. HART'S "ECCLESIASTICUS"

Ecclesiasticus. The Greek Text of Codex 248. Edited with a textual commentary and prolegomena by J. H. A. HART, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1909. xviii + 378 pages.

THE codex 248 in the apparatus of the large Septuagint edition begun by R. Holmes and concluded by J. Parsons (Holmes-Parsons, Oxford 1798-1827) corresponds to the Vatican MS. 346 which, together with the Vatican MS. 330 (= Holmes-Parsons 108) underlies in the main the first printed edition of the Greek text of the Old Testament (in the Complutensian Polyglot, 1514-1517). Of these two MSS., codex 248 was alone available for the book of Ecclesiasticus. Although in point of date—it is a cursive of the fourteenth century—it cannot compare with the uncials which in some cases ascend into the fourth century, its excellencies, through the medium of the Complutensian edition, have long been noted by Drusius (1596), Grabe (1709), Bretschneider (1806); and nearer to our own day, on the basis of the collation in Holmes-Parsons, by Edersheim (1888), though, singularly enough, Fritzsche (1871) had failed to perceive its importance. What was thus far a matter of inner evidence received confirmation in a manner most welcome through the discovery of the (fragmentary) Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus which for ever will be associated with the name of S. Schechter. In the preface to the edition of the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* prepared by Schechter in collaboration with the late Master of St. John's College (C. Taylor) (Cambridge 1899) it was pointed out that codex 248 either alone or in consonance with others of an equally humble, that is late, origin possessed readings, nay verses, otherwise unknown but harmonizing with the Cairo Hebrew text. It was at the instance of Dr. Schechter, as we learn now, that Professor Swete, the noted Septuagint editor, secured photo-

graphs of the Greek text of Ecclesiasticus mentioned above and invited the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press to publish a transcript. The work of publication has been carried out by Mr. Hart, Fellow of St. John's College.

So much for the history of the present publication which has been sponsored by such eminent scholars. The importance of the manuscript was so obvious to the editor that, barring a reference to Dr. Taylor's estimate, he has deemed it superfluous to sum up the excellencies of his codex or to indicate its place in the history of the Greek translation of Ben Sira. Or does this omission amount to a tacit acknowledgment that the subject has been fully treated in § 7 of Smend's Introduction to his Commentary on Ecclesiasticus (1906) and that the reader should for himself consult that work? For the purposes of this review where an adequate, though succinct, orientation is imperative Smend will indeed prove a most welcome guide. On the whole, we learn, codex 248, so far as its basis goes, is "undoubtedly the best of all". For, while it has not escaped corruptions which it has in common with many others, it alone has preserved a goodly number of correct readings, or at least it shares them with a few others. Thus it alone reads 11, 17 *εὐδοοῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* over against *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εὐδοωθήσεται* elsewhere. In 248 the verb is put first, exactly as in the Hebrew: **יַצְלַח לְעַד**. But that is of small moment. Of greater importance is the fact that the verb is put in the active voice and apparently is also intended in the active or transitive meaning (in 43, 26 the same form is used intransitively). Herein the Ethiopic translation concurs (*ḡāstafēsheh* "maketh glad"; the rendering, of course, is inexact). The variation in the Greek codices is based on a difference of exegetical conception: the Hebrew verb, written defectively (compare the spelling of the preceding word: **וּרְצִנִּי**), is naturally best pointed **יַצְלַח** and taken transitively. The example is an instructive one also for the student of our two English versions. In the Authorized Version we read: "*and his favour bringeth prosperity for ever*"; in the Revised: "*and his good pleasure shall prosper for ever*". That is to say, the older version follows the Complutensian (hence, mediately, codex 248), whereas the Revisers go

with the uncials, marking in this case as in many others a step backward.

Another notable example in which codex 248 is alone with its better reading and in agreement with the Hebrew is found in 43, 23. The Hebrew reads:

מחשבת. .שיק רבה ויט בתהום איים

Leaving out of our discussion for the moment whatever is irrelevant to an understanding of the general purport of the verse, so much is clear that the poet is describing God's wonders as they are manifested in the sea. It was permissible freedom on the part of the translator to combine the two nouns distributed over the two halves of the verse and to render them by one word: *the deep*; which procedure, of course, necessitated a pronominal reference thereto in the second half: *therein* (*in her*). All Greek codices further agree in their verb in the second half of the verse: *planted*. We thus recognize that ויט of our Hebrew text is faulty; ויטע was apparently the original. The second half of the verse reads accordingly in cod. 248 (and naturally in the Complutensian): καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους. And so our own Authorized Version: "and planteth islands therein." The steps of corruption through which the Greek text as still preserved in 248 has passed are all extant. Thus through haplography (writing once what should be written twice) the preposition dropped out: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτῇ νήσους (cod. 23). The ungrammatical sentence that ensued was corrected to read: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτὴν νήσους (cod. 253). The next step was for some Christian copyist to write: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς. Hence the note on the margin of the Revised Version: "The most ancient authorities read *Jesus planted it*"; had the Revisers been consistent, that reading would have been placed in the text. The most ancient authorities are the uncials. The error is indeed an old one, but it was apparently kept out of that manuscript whose lineal descendant codex 248 is. It may be of interest to add that, once "Jesus" took the place of "islands", he was reverently replaced by "the Lord" (in a number of cursives).

At the end of 11, 14 (immediately before the verse discussed above) a marginal note of the Revisers informs us: "Verses 15

and 16 are omitted by the best authorities". But the verses which the Authorized Version has duly incorporated in its text are found in cod. 248 along with several other cursives and are equally extant in the Hebrew! Another example is afforded by 16, 15, 16 (codex 248 and others, the Hebrew text). 3, 25 is an instance of a single verse omitted by "most authorities", but found in codex 248(.253 and partially 70) along with the Hebrew. The importance of codex 248 is thus proved conclusively, no matter what our opinion may be concerning its redundant stichoi (of which there are in the group of manuscripts of which codex 248 is the best representative about 150) and its other amplifications. Professor Smend (§ 8) adduces much proof in support of a thesis that all these amplifications go back in the main to a Hebrew original, though they may not be ascribed to Ben Sira himself. The process he conceives as follows: Ben Sira's unglossed original was translated by his grandson. The Hebrew original in course of time was touched up by an interpolator. With this amplified Hebrew text before him, some Greek-speaking Jew corrected the older Greek translation so as to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew as he knew it. The uncials on the whole have preserved the unglossed older translation; in codex 248 and the kindred manuscripts we have the contaminated text. That a double Greek translation existed may be proved by the fact that in a few cases the divergences in the Greek manuscripts are paralleled by similar divergences in the Hebrew. Thus for 5, 11 we have two Hebrew manuscripts (A and C) available; the text of A coincides with the ordinary Greek, while the text of C goes with 248 and 70. In other instances one and the same Hebrew text is found to contain a verse in a double version; on Greek ground the manuscripts divide themselves into two groups, according as they follow the one or the other. Compare 34, 20; 35, 22, and elsewhere (the second Greek text is represented by the Latin). Or our Hebrew exhibits the amplified text alone; accordingly it is found to correspond to an amplified form in a certain group of manuscripts. Compare 16, 3: the present Hebrew text is borne out by Chrysostom, the first corrector of the Sinaitic, and 248. 70.

That we are dealing only with one interpolator (glossator) and not with many is easily proved by the uniformity of ideas running through the entire range of amplifications. There is a certain character to them. The subject has been treated most fully by Schlatter (1897). His conclusion that the author of the glosses was a Greek (Alexandrian) Jew, either the philosopher Aristobulus or some one belonging to his school, is now easily refuted by the presence of a number of them in the Hebrew. Hence they must have all been written in Hebrew. Who was this Jew who was greatly concerned with emphasizing the love of the Lord (ἀγάπησις κυρίου; there is reason to believe that 11, 15 הַבָּי should be read in the place of אֱמֵן) rather than the fear of the Lord, who speaks of man's *cleaving* to God, of God's *reception* and *rejection* (πρόσληψις and ἐκβολή; comp. πρόσληψις and ἀποβολή Romans 11, 15), and of reward in a future life as the fruit of the tree of *immortality*, to mention but the most striking characteristics of his thought? Mr. Hart devotes to this question the second chapter of his "Prolegomena" (printed at the end of the volume). The discussion is a most thorough one, but the answer, I fear, will not commend itself to cautious readers. Some truth, of course, there is in designating the interpolator as a Pharisee and his recension of Ben Sira as Pharisaic. But there is more than that in Mr. Hart's thesis. Out of the sum of the glosses he would reconstruct the whole body of "Early" Pharisaic doctrine. It becomes thus necessary not only to identify positive Pharisaic teachings, but likewise to recognize in everything that is condemned or rejected at once a Sadducean doctrine. The method is that of Geiger, and is open to the same criticism. Mr. Hart tacitly accepts Geiger's identification of the Pharisees (*Perushim*, *Perishin*) with the *Nibdalim* of Nehem. 9, 2. "Being translated Pharisaism is Separatism. But Separatism was not an ideal which could thrill the nations with an instantaneous and irresistible appeal". In Mr. Hart's conception, the Pharisee is necessarily a missionary "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matth. 23, 15). By deft manipulations, "transliterations", as Mr. Hart calls them, he makes the *Pharisaism*, which means Separatism, appear to the Greeks as *Parrhesia*. The latter meant to the

Greek freedom of speech; the Jewish missionary, by a semasiological (though not "logical") twist, makes it to stand for confidence, confidence in one Master. But P-R-Sh, a "versatile" root, means also *making distinct*. And so the Pharisaic glossator plays with Greek ἀκρίβεια *exactitude*; the *Pharisee* becomes a *Precisian* (which assonance, alas, is lost on Greek ears). The interpolator dwells repeatedly on ἐπαγγελία *promise*. The very same Greek word occurs in the Greek translation of Esther (4, 7: καὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν (τοῦ ἀργυρίου) ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο and the promise (of the silver) that ... had promised). The corresponding Hebrew word is *parashah* (lit. *making distinct*, hence *exact statement*). The translator of Esther, as elsewhere, is given to the very opposite of literalism; he translates according to the general sense; the combination with *Pharisaism* is furthest from his mind. Mr. Hart is of a different opinion. In the two other places where the Greek word "stands as an equivalent to some Hebrew word, it is always to a word, whose root belongs in one way or another to the *Teaching of the Scribes of (or?) the Pharisees*". The passages in question are Amos 9, 6 and Ps. 55 (56), 8. In the former place אֲנִתָּהּ was misconceived as אֲנִתָּהּ. The student interested in the history of the *Haggadah* will be glad to learn how old that word is even in its Aramaized form *Aggadah*. The Greek equivalent may and may not have meant *promise*; it was chosen for the reason that the verb from which the Hebrew noun is derived is so often translated by ἀγγέλλειν and its compounds. In the other place, the Greek word corresponds to *Siphrah* (not *Sepher*, as Mr. Hart writes). But just as ἐξήγγειλας (so read for ἐξήγγειλα; the *s* dropped out in front of σύ 27. 156 (σοι of the others is clearly an error; comp. the opposite Judg. 12, 1 συνεθροίσθησαν 75 for -ροίσθησαν 54. 82) = אָתָּה) corresponds to סִפְרָתָהּ (as the translator read for סִפְרָתָהּ), so does ἐπαγγελία to סִפְרָה. The *Sopher* was altogether foreign to the translator's mind. Mr. Hart has, however, overlooked a third passage. Of course, the Oxford Concordance, as so often, failed to register the Hebrew equivalent. I mean the passage I Esdras 1, 7 = II Chron. 35, 8: κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν corresponds to לְנִרְכָּה. The translation is again a bit free. But surely no mean stretch of the imagination would be required to

drag in in this instance the *Scribe* or *Pharisee*. Another "echo of *Pharisee*" Mr. Hart finds in the *peras* of Abot 1, 3 with which he identifies the *merces dei* (Latin 18, 22; comp. 2, 9 248).

Another case of paronomasia in which Mr. Hart so much delights is the (tacit) antithesis between the *Musar*, or Discipline, with which a Sage like Ben Sira was concerned, and the *Masorah*, or Tradition, the stock-in-trade of the Scribes. Now there is nothing in the interpolated passages to directly suggest the latter term. But Mr. Hart is inventive, or ingenious, enough to furnish an example. I reproduce his conclusions at which he arrives inductively, in the opposite, deductive, manner. Akiba designates Tradition as a "fence" (סִינָה) to the Law. סוּנָה Cant. 7, 2 is rendered in the Septuagint πεφραγμένη. According to the testimony of Jerome, περίφραγμα was used by one of the Greek translators for MASOR (Micah 7, 12). Hence περίφραγμα "was the proper equivalent of the sound *Masorah*". Mr. Hart says, *sound*; that is to say, the orthography and the underlying etymology are of no moment (מסורה and מצור!). A parallel Greek form is περιφραγή, *fence*. Thus was the Pharisaic tradition designated in Greek. A friend or a foe passed therefrom easily to περιγραφή, "About-Scripture". This, according to Mr. Hart, is the sense of the word in 22, 23. The Greek word, it must be admitted, is difficult in the context. The meaning "mean estate" assumed by the Authorized Version cannot be paralleled elsewhere. Nevertheless Mr. Hart's exegesis will hardly convince students who are less imaginative.

And one more instance of "ingenious" combination. 11, 11: "There is one that laboureth, and taketh pains, and maketh haste, and is so much the more behind" is followed in 70. 253 by the gloss: "because of the ἐπαγγελία of his own shoulders". The phrase occurs elsewhere in a late Greek writer (Philostratus). Mr. Hart combines the "*promise* (or, as he renders, *profession*) of the shoulders" with the פְּרוּשׁ שִׁכְמִי, the type of the reprehensible Pharisee who carries the commandments upon his *shoulder* (טעין מצוותא על כיתפא) p. Berakot 14b). It is certainly ingenious, but far from convincing.

The missionary Scribe once more reappears in Mr. Hart's Prolegomena. He is the connecting link between the second and

first chapter. Mr. Hart sums up in the latter the results of a penetrating exegesis of the Prologue (the genuine one of the uncials, not the spurious fabrication of codex 248) under six heads. The sixth thesis reads. "He (that is, the grandson) came to Egypt and remained there in accordance with the rule of his order, which prescribed foreign travel and missionary work as part of a Scribe's novitiate." What is the basis for assuming that there was such an institution as *peregrinatio Scribarum*? Here are the data as they present themselves to Mr. Hart. The Prologue opens with the statement that since Israel possesses in the Law and the Prophets and the others that followed them a great store of instruction and wisdom, and since it is proper that the scribes (τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας) should not only become intelligent themselves, but also useful (χρησίμους) to them without (τοῖς ἐκτός) by speech and by writing, the grandfather, after a diligent study (ἀνάγνωσις) of the Law and the Prophets and the other books of the fathers wherein he gained sufficient skill, was impelled himself also to compose a work pertaining to instruction and wisdom, etc. "Those without" would seem naturally to point to the laity; according to Mr. Hart, the phrase designates those in the Dispersion (comp. τοῖς ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ at the end of the Prologue), "Jews, or Gentiles". To these it is the duty of the Scribe to become "useful"; Mr. Hart adds, as missionaries, "or, to use the older term, as Apostles. In Hebrew the difference between Apostle (שָׁלִיחַ) and useful (root צִלַח) is small enough to be disregarded". So it is a case of paronomasia again. It is, however, to say the least, an unwarranted assumption in substantiation of which two verses in the body of the book (10, 4 f.) are subjected to textual and exegetical distortion, and that in the face of the Hebrew which is extant! The verses in question read as follows:

ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου ἐξουσία τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸν χρήσιμον ἐγερεῖ εἰς καιρὸν
ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

בִּיד אֱלֹהִים מִמְשַׁלַּת תָּבֵל
וְאִישׁ לַעַת יַעֲמֵד עָלֶיהָ:

ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου ἐνὸς ἀνδρός,
καὶ προσώπῳ γραμματέως ἐπιθήσει
δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

בִּיד אֱלֹהִים מִמְשַׁלַּת כָּל גִּבּוֹר
וּלְפָנַי מִחוּקֵק יֵשִׁית הוֹדוֹ:

The Hebrew text leaves no doubt that Ben Sira meant by the *meḥoḳek* a *prince*. The translator substituted "*scribe*" after the manner of the Targums (comp. Smend and Hart *ad locum*). But the Scribe is needed by Mr. Hart for his constructions, especially since he is paralleled in the preceding verse by the "useful man". But the adjective "useful" does not appear in the Hebrew, on the surface at any rate. The truth is namely that the adjective is derived from the context; it is a free, but justifiable, addition. Mr. Hart, however, is bent upon vindicating for it a Hebrew origin. In his Notes he retranslates it as כִּשָּׁר (so does Lévi); here he believes that it is an alternative of *εὐδία ἀνδρός* in the next verse to which in the Hebrew some derivative of צֶלַח corresponded. Smend is also tempted to postulate on the basis of *εὐδία* (comp. 38, 13) מַצְלַחַת for מַמְשֶׁלֶת. But he does not press his point. Mr. Hart, however, needs the juxtaposition of the *Scribe* and the *useful man*; and so the text must be twisted accordingly. There is absolutely no foundation for the thesis that "Jesus ben Sira and his fellow sages inherited the prophecy that Israel should be the light of the Gentiles and strove to effect its fulfilment; they had a care for those without, whether they were Jews who needed confirmation, proselytes who needed instruction or pagans who needed conversion". To Ben Sira the sum and substance of Isaiah's book of prophecies consisted in "comforting them that mourned for Zion" (48, 24). "Those without" meant to the grandson simply the laity.

Equally unfounded is the fifth thesis: "The younger ben Sira came to Egypt in 247 B. C. and took part in the translation of the Wisdom Literature which was then proceeding. His contribution was probably more than the rendering of his grandfather's composition". We may divide the thesis into two parts: (1) the grandson came to Egypt in 247 B. C.; (2) he took part in the translation of a part of the Bible over and above the rendition of his grandfather's work. The first proposition turns about the exegesis of the preposition *ἐπι* (line 16 of Swete's edition), as is well known a muchly disputed point. According to Mr. Hart, the preposition is far from being a pleonastic ornament, but a very significant element. The thirty-eighth year refers to the

death-year of Ptolemy Philadelphus who reigned thirty-eight years; it was the year in which Euergetes (I.) succeeded to the throne, and that is the purport of the second chronological date significantly introduced by the preposition. Mr. Hart argues that under Euergetes II. whose policy was "Egypt for the Egyptians" the time was inopportune for the grandson's missionary journey. However that may be, the force of an innocent preposition which has its parallels in Septuagint Greek and in the papyri cannot be strained to the point of constructing a chronological theory which must remain questionable. The date of Ben Sira himself is not affected whether we follow the current interpretation of ἐπί or not; that depends on the meaning of πάππος and the identification of Simon the Priest. As for the second proposition, it is based entirely upon an unwarranted differentiation of τήνδε τήν βιβλίον (line 19) and τὸ βιβλίον (line 21). The two are of course identical. Mr. Hart, however, makes the second noun refer to some other book, perhaps even the Bible. To say the least, there is left but scant time between the reign of Philadelphus and the death of Euergetes I. for the entire Scriptures to be done into Greek. The "space of time" was clearly ample for translating the Wisdom of Ben Sira, but hardly for much else beside. Mr. Hart is indeed constrained to assume that "the limits of the undertaking (as set by Demetrius of Phalerum and Ptolemy Philadelphus) were exceeded, so that the Prophecies and other books were included with the Law in the Alexandrian translation" (fourth thesis). The Seventy must then indeed have been a zealous body; they are in truth designated by Mr. Hart as "missionaries". So much, however, is beyond doubt to anybody without a pet theory of his own that the translator of Ben Sira found in Egypt the tripartite Bible in Greek; freely as he criticises that translation, he at the same time permits us to infer that it enjoyed no small measure of authority.

Of the four chapters of the Prolegomena which seems to be a collective name for essays on Ben Sira only the two last ("The Quotations of Clement of Alexandria" and "The Conflict of the Rival Greek Versions") have an immediate bearing on codex 248; the third ("The Pharisaic Recension of the Wisdom of Ben Sira")

is only indirectly connected therewith, and the first ("The Prologue of the Greek Translator") not at all. The edition is further enriched by a valuable Textual Commentary which, we are told, was in the main printed off in 1903. The only regret which one may be permitted to express concerning these Notes is that they were not based primarily on the codex edited. As the case stands, the references to codex 248 are casual and on a line with the rest of the textual material industriously gathered together. As for the character of the Notes, I have examined the part dealing with 3, 6-24 more closely. A few remarks may be apposite. Verse 6: *τιμησει* = **ת**.— Verse 12: The propounded emendation *γερα* is not convincing. The translator rather read בכבר for בכבוד, comp. כביר Job 15,10.— Verse 16. מנדה is probable; but comp. Smend.— עוב is possible, but not necessary; comp. *ἐγκ.* = מאס ב Isa. 41, 9.— In *b* no attempt is made to explain **Ⲅ**; comp. Smend. Perhaps the Hebrew text represents a *tikkun*: the original then read: כי מנדה בזה אביו ומקלל בוראו מכעיס אמו.— Verse 17: Not עשוי, but מעשוי; so Smend.— *Ib.*: The Latin points to *υπερ ανθρωπον δεκτον*. The original probably read איש הן, comp. Prov. 19, 6 where *ουειδος* = חסד ~ הן.— Verse 18. Not כן; **Ⲅ** read בכל; *σσω ... τοσουτω* expresses כל, comp. the Latin. — *Ib.*: Not "humble thyself from", but "hold thyself too humble for"; comp. Gen. 32, 11 and the Oxford Gesenius, p. 582 *b*.—*Ib.* *χαριν* = **ת**; comp. Gen. 43, 14; Dan. 1, 9.— Verse 21: *βαθυτερα* = עמוקה p. Hag. 77 *c* (Smend).— *Ib.* *ερευνα* is either a synonymous variant, or = חשאל Gen. 1. ch. 8; comp. Deut. 23, 24(15).— Verse 22: *χρεια* = צרך (Peters; rejected by Smend) or חקר (Hag. 13 *a* M).— Verse 23: *περιεργαζον* is a crux on which nothing is said, but on which a good deal might be said.— Verse 24. Very inadequate. For רעות רעות (nobody seems to notice the difficulty) comp. ענינות רחוקות, 7, 2, יסורי התורה Maimon. ועשתנתיו מתטרפות id. 1, 5 (see Bacher, *Tanchum*, 123).

To the Textual Commentary belongs also the "Appendix" which contains a collation of the Syro-Hexaplar with the text of B.

The reprint of codex 248 is a faithful one; wherever the editor has deemed it necessary to deviate from his text, the reading of the codex is given on the margin. Of course, a permissible difference of opinion may obtain as to what constitutes the task

of the editor of a single codex. Mr. Hart adopted the plan of a mere reprint after the fashion of the edition of the Alexandrine text of the Book of Judges by Brooke-McLean (Cambridge 1897). But then the entire apparatus which follows and which at best has only indirect connections with the codex edited should have remained away, valuable as it all may be in spite of the strictures to which the bolder propositions are open. There was certainly another plan, perhaps a more difficult one, possible: to wit, an edition after the manner of that of the first five chapters of Judges by Lagarde (*Septuagintastudien I*). While in point of fact a definitive grouping of the Greek manuscripts of Ecclesiasticus may be premature, the medley of variants contained in Parsons' apparatus might have conveniently, though provisionally, been grouped about codex 248 on the one and B on the other hand. An edition like that, perhaps even with the Syriac and Hebrew texts added, a sort of Tetrapla, would have served much more effectively to bring out the value of the codex 248. Nevertheless, it behooves us to be thankful for what we have received. We are once more brought face to face with the fact that the collation of (Holmes-)Parsons is unreliable. I have compared Mr. Hart's reprint of codex 248 with the data in Parsons; the following list of corrections has been the result:

Parsons	Hart
tit. Σοφια Ιησουν υιον Σιραχ	prm ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ
—	tit. (post prologum)
	ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ
1, 18 φοβος Κυριον (sil)	φοβεισθαι τον κυριον = 70. Compl.
— 24 παραβολη (sil)	παραβολαι = 70. Compl.
2, 1 τω Κυριω Θεω (vid)	τω κυριω = 106. 307. Compl.
— 6 ευθυνον (sil)	prm και = 55. 155. 157. 296. 307.
	Compl.
— 9 Κυριον (sil)	prm τον = 253
3, 3 εξιλασεται (sil)	εξιλασκεται (i. e., κ delet) = Compl.
— 6 fin (sil)	+ ο φοβουμενος Κυριον τιμησει πατερα
— 24 μεν	μη = 253. Compl.
— — αμοιρος ων	αμοιρων = Compl.
4, 10 ορφανους (sil)	ορφανω = Compl.

- 24 εν ρηματι (sil) εν ρημασι = Compl.
- 5, 5 εν πλεονασμοις (ut vid scr εν πλεονασμω = Compl.
πλεονασμους)
- 34 σοφος (sil) Cod. prima manu σοι: secunda σοφ⁰
- 37 σου >248. 106. 155. 157. Compl.
- 7, 18 αδιαφορον μηδε εν αδιαφορον κατα μηδε εν = Compl.
- 8, 2 αντιστηση αντιστησει = 157. Compl.
- 9, 9 ολισθησης ολισθης = 55. 157. Compl.
- 10, 4 εξουσια prn η = 23. 55. 106. 155. 157.
Compl.
- 6 μηνιασης μηνισης = 23. 106. Compl.
- 9 ενδοσθια εντοσθια
- 18 ανθρωπος ανος
- 24 μεγισταν δε μεγαστανες = 23. Compl.
- 25 πας δενομενος παιδενομενος = Compl.
- 12, 2 ευσεβει ευσεβη = 106. 307. Compl.
- 3 ελεημοσυνην ελεημοσυννης = Compl.
- 16 ανατρεψαι (sil) αναστρεψαι = Ald. (comp. 23).
>
- 13, 2 (και πλουσιωτερω) σου sup sec manu
- ab al. m.
- 26 διαλογισμοι (sil) διαλογισμος = 23. 253. Compl.
- 14, 15 διαιρεσιν (sil) διαιρεσεις = 55. 106. 157. 307.
Compl. διαιρεσις 155
- 16 τροφην (sil) τροφην = Compl.
- 25 χειρας (sil) χειρα
- 15, 3 ποτισει (sil) ποτιει = 155. 157. 254. 296. 307.
Compl.
- 8 υπερηφανιας prn απο = 106. Compl.
- 13 καθυστερησει (sil) -ριση comp. -ρηση 106. 307. Compl.
- 18 σαλευθησονται -θησεται 155. 296*. Compl.
- 19 εις τ' αυτα Κυριον επ' αυτα Κυριον = Compl.
- 28 εθλιψε (sil) εξεθλιψε(ν) = 23. 55. 106. 155. 307.
307. Compl.
- 17, 6 ερμηνεια ερμενεα
- 28 μηδε (sil) μηδεν
- 31 και πονηρος (sil) και ανηρ ος = Compl.
- 18, 4 εξιχνιασει (sil) εξιχνιασε = Compl.
- 10 και ψηφος αμμου (sil) και ως ψηφος αμμου = Compl.

— 16 κρεισσων (sil)	κρεισσον 307. Compl.
—27 και αφρων συντηρησει καιρον	και αφρων ου συντηρησει καιρον = 106. Compl.
19, 12 βελος (sil)	μελος
— 25 εστι δικαιων κρισει σοφος	και εστι κτλ. = Compl.
21, 2 οδοντες αυτης (sil)	οδοντες αυτη = Compl.
22, 7 καθενδοντα (sil)	καθενδοντας = Compl.
— 15 αλα (sil)	αλας = 253. 296. Compl.
— 22 εν τουτοις (sil)	+ γαρ = Compl.
23, 10 αμαρτιας	αμαρτιων
— 14 συνεδρευεις (sil)	συνεδρευσεις = Compl.
— 22 καταλειπουσα (sil)	καταλειπουσα = Compl.
24, 4 κατεσκηνωσα (sil)	+ μονη
— 6 κυμασι (sil)	κυματι = Compl.
— 7 μετα τουτων (sil)	prm και = Compl.
— 9 αιωνος (sil)	αιωνων = 253. Compl.
25, 3 εν νεοτητι σου	εν νεοτητι
— 17 σκοτει (sil)	σκοτοι
26, 12 συνεγγυς (sil)	συνσεγγυς pr. m.
— 18 ευγεων	ευγεον
27, 12 διανοουμενων (sil)	- νου
27, 27 κυλισθησεται (sil)	ανλισθησεται = Compl.
28, 10 κατα την ισχυν	prm κατα την στερεωσιν της μαχης το πυρ ανζηθησεται = Compl.
— 24 και το χρυσιον σου	και χρυσιον σου
— 15 mrg. εγγυς	εγγυης
— 27 επεξενωται	επιξενωται
30, 1 ενδελεχισει	ενδελεχισει = 106. Compl.
— 15 Περι βρωματος	Περι βρωματων
— 18 εκλεισμενα	κεκλεισμενα = Compl.
— 16 επληρωσα (sil)	επλησα = 23. Compl.
— 25 ζητησει	ζητησει = Compl.
31, 10 επειρασθη (sil)	επειρασθη = 23. 106. 155. Compl.
32, 15 και η καταβοησις (sil)	+ αυτου = Compl.
34, 10 εστω (sil)	εσται = 106. 254. Compl.
— 24 διαγογγυσει (sil)	γογγυσει
35 tit. Περι ηγουμενων (sil)	> 248. 55. 106. 155. 157. 253. 254. 296. 307. Compl.

— 18 αλλοτριος (sil)	+ δε = 307. Compl.
— — μετ αυτου (sil)	μεθ εαυτου = Compl.
36, 17 ικετων (sil)	οικετων = A. 155. Compl.
38, 13 ευωδια (sil)	ευοδια = Grabe
— 16 εναρξε (sil)	εναρξαι = 68. 106. 254. 307. Compl.
— 27 υπομονη (sil)	επιμονη = 157. 253. 296. 307
— 28 σφυρας	+ και ακμονος = Compl.
39, 2 διηγησεις (sil)	διηγησιν = 23. 55. 106. 155. 157. 254. 296. 307. Compl.
— — στροφαις (sil)	τροφαις
— 4 ηγουμενον (sil)	ηγουμενων = 23. 55. 106. 157. 253. 254. 296. 307. Compl.
— 27 ταυτα παντα (sil)	tr
— 28 πνευματι (sil)	πνευματα
— 31 χρειας (sil)	χειρας = A. Compl.
40, 1 εαν	εως
— 4 νακινθινον	νακινθον
41, 32 φιλων (sil)	φιλον = 55. 254. Compl.
42, 5 αδιαφορον (sil)	διαφορον = A. 155. 157. 307. Compl.
— 17 ο (παντοκρατωρ)	> 248. Compl.
43, 23 αβυσσος (sil)	αβυσσος = 55. 106. 155. 157.
44, 5 διηγουμενοι (sil)	prn και = 55. 106. 155. 157. 254. 296. Compl.
— 18 ετεθησαν (sil)	εσταθησαν = 253. Compl.
45, 3 λογοις (sil)	λογιοις = Compl.
— — αυτον (sil)	ατον
— 8 σκευεσιν (sil)	prn εν = Compl.
47, 8 και ηγαπησε τον ποιησαντα αυτον >; hab mrg.	
— 18 του (Θεου)	σου = Compl.
— 19 σου	συν
48, 14 και εν τελευτη αυτου	και εν τη τελευτη αυτου = Compl.
49, 5 εδωκαν (sil)	εδωκε(ν) = 155*. Compl.
— 6 ενεπυρησαν	ενεπρησαν = Compl.
50, 2 περιβολον (sil)	περιβολον = Compl.
— 9 ολοσφυρητον (sil)	ολοσφυρατον = 23. 55. 254
— 20 Κυριω (sil)	Κυριου = 23. 253. Compl.
— 10 εγκαταλιπειν (sil)	εγκαταλιπη

— 14 <i>ναον</i> (sil)	<i>incertum an ναον</i>
— 21 <i>κοιλια</i> (sil)	<i>καρδια</i>
— 24 <i>διψωσαι</i> (sil)	<i>διψωσι</i>

I have omitted from the list matters orthographical and the like which have no immediate bearing upon the sense. The list affords correction in 118 places. Which, of course, goes to show how inaccurate the collation of Parsons is. One important result of Mr. Hart's reprint is the knowledge how much closer the identity of the Complutensian text and codex 248 is. Otherwise the net practical result is an extremely meager one. For, as may be readily seen, in the majority of cases the reading of codex 248 is identical with a reading adduced by Parsons from other sources. The same observation has been made by Smend with reference to other codices imperfectly collated by Parsons; a comparison of the parts of the larger Cambridge edition so far issued with the corresponding parts of Holmes-Parsons reveals the same state of affairs. Holmes-Parsons is still a useful guide for all practical purposes.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS

HILPRECHT'S "NEW DELUGE TABLET"

The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.
Series D: Researches and Treatises, edited by H. V. HILPRECHT. Vol. V. Fasciculus I. *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and The Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. HILPRECHT. "Eckley Brinton Coxe, Junior, Fund." Philadelphia, published by the UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, 1910. pp. 65.

ANY work dealing with what is called "The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story" is bound to attract the greatest interest on the part of the Assyriologists and all students of the Bible. The fascinating story of the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions and the great achievements of Rawlinson, Layard, and Oppert penetrated after all but a small circle, the student of Assyriology or the larger number of educated people to whom ancient history appealed. But it was the discovery of a fragment of the Deluge Tablet in the British Museum by George Smith in 1872 which brought out the interest of a vastly greater number of students and the public at large, and was directly responsible for further expeditions. In a sense the Assyrian or Babylonian Deluge Story has been symbolical in the minds of many of the relations between Babylonian investigations and biblical studies. This fact alone makes any new version of the story of importance; exactly because of the great popular interest, restraint is imposed upon sober scholars.

The fragment containing an early account of the Babylonian Deluge Story, published in the present volume, was excavated by the fourth Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Hilprecht, its decipherer and interpreter, asserts that it was inscribed 600 years before the time generally assigned to Moses, and that in its preserved portion it shows a

much greater resemblance to the biblical Deluge Story than any other fragment discovered hitherto. The main proof for the age of the fragment rests on the place of its discovery. It was found, according to Hilprecht, intermingled with other partly dated tablets which were inscribed about 2100 B. C. and earlier. This conclusion is further confirmed, as Hilprecht maintains, by philological proofs, namely by the use of the sign PI for the syllable *wa* in *wa-ši-e* and the change of *s* to *z*, when preceded by the dental *t*, or by a sibilant.

In connection with the published fragment the volume contains a description and general survey of the character and contents of the Temple Library of Nippur. Of special interest in this survey is the fourth chapter, dealing with a new inscription and the time of an ancient King of Suti, Erridu-pizir.

Concerning the age of the fragment, palæographically it may belong to an old Babylonian period, probably to the date assigned to it by Hilprecht. But the assertion ought not to have been made with absolute certainty, since no claim is made in this volume that the author personally found the tablet in the lowest stratum or supervised the packing of the boxes. Leaving aside the place of discovery, it might have been inscribed two hundred years later, at the time of Ammi-zaduga, and thus be contemporary with Father Scheil's version, as the use of PI for *wa* and the treatment of the sibilants as in *binuzza* are indisputably found throughout the whole period of the Hammurabi dynasty. As for PI, it might even belong to a Cassite period; since Hilprecht admits that PI had at this time the reading of *wi*, there is no reason why it should not have been used for *wa* as well. As a matter of fact, however, the sign PI for *wa* is even found in Neo-Babylonian, as in *wa-ash-ru*, *wa-at-ru-tim* (thus are these words written in the Code of Hammurabi), in which PI stands of course for *wa*, not *a* or *'a*, no matter whether the *waw* sound was pronounced or not. In the opinion of the writer, however, it is quite irrelevant whether the tablet was inscribed two hundred years earlier or later. The scribe did not invent this story, even if it was written in the Cassite period, but most likely copied it from another tablet, as we know that the version published by Father

Scheil, dated at the time of Ammi-zaduga, was copied from another tablet.

As for the resemblance of this version to the biblical narrative, Hilprecht attaches great importance to the two following features: In this version it seems to be Ellil (Bēl), the highest god of Nippur, who both causes the Deluge and saves the Babylonian Noah from destruction, just as in the biblical version both actions are done by the Lord: and in this version occurs the expression *mīnu*, 'number,' in *ku-um mi-ni* 'instead of a number,' which is identical with Hebrew מִן in the biblical version (in P). Both arguments are very precarious. Supposing that the author of the biblical Deluge Story had actually taken it from the version of Ashurbanipal's Library, even then he must have represented the only existing God as the destroyer and the savior. How could he help doing otherwise without throwing overboard monotheism? The interpretation of *ku-um mi-ni* "instead of a number" = 'instead of many,' is rather peculiar. Admitting that Hebrew מִן is a Babylonian loan-word, how could a word 'number' signify 'many'? On the contrary, we would expect *mīnu* to have the meaning of 'a few,' in opposition to *lā mīnu*, 'numberless,' corresponding to Hebrew מְסַפֵּר and Arabic *ma'dūd*. The writer, therefore, would propose, with all reserve, a different reading and interpretation of *ku-um mi-ni*. It is now well known that in a great many personal names of the time of the Hammurabi-dynasty, and in some of the Cassite period, MI without the determinative GISH, is an ideogram for *šillu*, 'shadow, protection,' as in the names *Šilli*(MI-NI)-*Shamash Tā-ab-šillum* (MI-LUM), etc., etc., (see Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, 247, note 2). Accordingly, there is absolutely no reason to prevent us from reading here as well *ku-um šilli* (MI with phonetic complement NI = *li*), 'The place of shadow.' Admitting the reading, the question would now arise as to its meaning. Since the ship was made for the purpose of 'carrying what has been saved of life,' we should be rather inclined to assume that figuratively it was very befittingly called 'the place of protection.' In this case, however, all the persons and objects that had to be saved ought to have been enumerated before *ku-um šilli*, and it seems that *ki[n]-ta*, "the family," occurs afterwards. And there-

fore, it is more likely that a certain part of the ship, occupied by the animals, was called *ku-um šilli*. As a matter of fact, a part of a ship was called *šillu*, as II R. 62, No. 2, 70, where parts of a ship are enumerated, we find: GISH-GISH-MI-MA = *šil-lum elippi*, literally 'the shadow of the ship,' which could only mean 'the dark part, the ship's hold.' Then *ku-um šilli* would be an exact formation like *ān šilli* 'receptacle of shadow' = 'prison'—if not a synonym—and might well correspond to the תַּחְתִּיִּם, 'the lowest cells of the ark' of the Biblical version which were most likely intended as a dwelling-place for the animals. (According to the Midrash, however, the upper cells were for the human beings, the middle for the animals, and the lowest for the dung). The asyndetic expressions before *ku-um šilli*, namely 'the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven,' point, of course, to a third class of enumerated beings or things. The writer, in accordance with the First Nineveh Version 79, would propose to supplement *ū zēr napshāte kalāma* 'and all kinds of living beings'—a general expression, including the creeping things on the ground and species which could not be classified under *bul* nor *umām širim* and had to be saved as well, as mice, rats, etc., and exactly correspond to the biblical expression וּמִכָּל־הַחַי וּמִכָּל־הַרֶמֶשׂ. Beside this, there are a few other points in Hilprecht's interpretation to which the writer takes exception: *a-pa-ash-shar* (l. 2) he translates "I will loosen," and supplements *uṣurāt*, respectively *kippāt shamē ū iršitim*, 'the confines of heaven and earth.' This is rather questionable, since it seems, according to the First Nineveh Version 103-104, that the Babylonian Deluge was not caused by a torrent, but by a cyclone which drove the waters of the sea over the dry land (s. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 388). It would, therefore, be better to read and translate [*naḫbe apsi ū tamāte*] *a-pa-ash-shar* 'the fountains of the sea and oceans I will set free.' We may perhaps compare Job 38, 8-11: וַיִּסַּךְ בְּדִלְתֵי יָם... וַאֲמַר עַד פֹּה תִבָּא וְלֹא תוֹסִיף.

In l. 5 the first sign seems to be *e*, and since, according to the First Nineveh Version 170-175, the Deluge was caused to destroy wicked mankind, we may perhaps read [*e-li ni-shi la ki*]-*e-ni*, 'over the faithless mankind.' In l. 11, if the first

sign is *lam*, we might supplement *bu* and read *bu-lam* 'tame animals,' in opposition to *umam širim*, 'wild animals.'

The following is a transliteration and translation of the fragment proposed by the writer, with the supplementes enclosed in brackets:

TRANSLITERATION.

1. (?) -sha (?) -shi (?) -il (?) -i (?)
(?) -ka
2. [naḫ-be ap-si-i u ta-ma-a-ti] a-pa-ash-shar.
3. [a-bu-ba a-sha-ka-an-ma] ka-la ni-shi ish-te-nish i-za-bat
4. [u at-ta-ma she-'-i na-pish]-ti la-am a-bu-bi wa-ši-e
5. [e-li ni-shi la ki]-e-ni ma-la i-ba-ash-shu lu-kin ub-bu-ku
lu-pu-ut-tu ḥu-ru-shu
6. (iṣu) elippam ra-be-tam bi-ni ma
7. ga-be-e gab-bi lu bi-nu-uz- za
8. . . . shi-i lu (iṣu) ma-gurgurru ba-bil (?) -lu na-at-rat
na-pish-tim
9. . . . -ri (?) zu-lu-la dan-na zu-ul-lil
10. [elippam sha] te-ip-pu- shu
11. . . . [bu]-lam (?) ú-ma-am ši-rim iṣ-ṣur sha-me-e
12. [u zēr na-ap-sha-te ka-la-ma shu-li a-na] ku-um ṣil(MI)-li
(NI)
13. u ki[n]-ta ru(?)
14. u

TRANSLATION.

1. 'thee(?)
2. '[the fountains of the see and oceans] I will set free,
3. '[a deluge I will make and] it shall take away all men
together;
4. . . . '[but thou seek life] before the deluge cometh forth
5. . . . '[For over all faithless men], as many as there are, I will
bring overthrow, destruction, annihilation.
6. 'build a great ship and
7. 'total height (?) shall be its structure
8. 'it shall be a *magur*-boat carrying (?) what has
been saved of life

9. . . . 'with a strong deck cover
10. '[the ship which] thou shalt make.
11. . . . '[tame anim]als, the beasts of the field, the birds of
heaven,
12. '[and all kinds of living beings bring into] the ship's hold
13. . . . 'and the family
14. . . . 'and

JACOB HOSCHANDER

THE HARKAVY "FESTSCHRIFT"

Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy aus Anlass seines am 20. November 1905 vollendeten siebenzigsten Lebensjahres . . . herausgegeben von Baron D. v. GUENZBURG und I. MARKON. (זכרון לאברהם אליהו). St. Petersburg 1908. pp. iii + 507 + 178 + iv, 8°.

DR. HARKAVY is one of the most prominent of Jewish scholars who, through untiring work, acute combinations, and fortunate finds, has contributed largely to the progress of Jewish scholarship, and is a master in many different branches of Jewish history and literature. He is since the death of Steinschneider perhaps the greatest authority in Jewish Arabic literature; there are very few who are equally well acquainted with the early history of the Jews in Poland; he has contributed very much to our knowledge of palæography, chronology, the Gaonic period, mediæval Hebrew poetry, Jewish sectarianism, and especially Karaite literature. And the activity of the many-sided scholar is not even completely covered by these different branches, as a superficial glance over the 392 titles of his works and articles will show. They at the same time testify to the interest he has taken in many practical questions of contemporary life, as education, Haskala, and colonization of Palestine. Harkavy certainly has done his full share in the studies to which his life is devoted. We wish the venerable scholar a long and happy continuation of his useful and important activity.

The present Jubilee volume in his honor appears three years after the great scholar reached the age of seventy years. But this delay seems to have had very favorable consequences for the book, as it contains an unusual number of important contributions and takes a prominent place among the many similar publications we have seen during the last twenty-five years. Thirty-

eight scholars have contributed to the volume which is divided into a Hebrew part (quoted in the following as I) with 26 contributions, and a non-Hebrew part (II), containing eight articles in German, two in French, one in English, and one in Neo-Greek. The editors are to be congratulated that they did not limit the space of the single contributions so that it became possible to include lengthy studies like those of Bornstein and Poznański, and full editions of important texts like those by Bacher, Brody, and Israelsohn. Altogether, editions take a very prominent part in this volume, as in the literary activity of Harkavy. Almost every branch of Jewish literature is represented in the present volume. Bible, Hellenism, Talmud, and Midrash, as well as Gaonic and mediæval history and literature receive impartial attention.

The articles are preceded by a separately paged bibliography of Harkavy's writings (p. ix-lii). It is divided according to languages. Hebrew (148 nos., 56 books and series of articles, 81 articles in periodicals, and collective writings, and 11 additions to works of others); Russian (140 numbers of which 9 are separate books, and 17 additions to other works); German (86 to which No. 391 is to be added, which deals with R. Mubashshir, not Sefer ha-Galuy); French (11 nos.), and English (6 nos.). This collection of the dispersed articles of Harkavy's is of great value and will prove useful for the student as the contents of the articles are as a rule briefly indicated. Yet in a case like No. 101 a more detailed account of the contents of the article ought to have been given, though it might have become rather lengthy. The cross-references from one article to another have been added very carefully, where both deal with similar points. I only noticed that in No. 346 the reference to No. 8 is omitted. In the bibliography itself I would note a few omissions: After No. 67, *כפתור ופרח* in *ירושלים*, V, 363 = *כפתור ופרח*, 893, and after 75 *הערות שונות* in *Ha-Karmel*, VII, No. 11. After 319, *Erwiderung* in *Liter. Centralblatt*, 1876, pp. 964-6, against Chwolson's *Erklärung*, *ib.*, 737-38. After 377, Review of Petermann's Samaritan Grammar in *Revue Critique*, 1874, No. 5, pp. 65-67. It is peculiar that Harkavy's edition of Judah Halevi's poems (Warsaw 1894-5) is not mentioned. In the addition of the reviews of

Harkavy's works the bibliography naturally is not complete, e.g. Brüll's valuable reviews are never mentioned, cf. for No. 1 his *Jahrbücher*, V, 190-191; No. 3, *ib.*, 192-194; No. 4, *ib.*, IX, 123-128; No. 58, *ib.*, 167 f. (where a reprint of 9 pages is mentioned); No. 289, *ib.*, III, 128-131. The last number was also reviewed by P. F. Frankl, *MGWJ.*, XXV (1876), 418-427, and Riehm, *ZDMG.*, XXX, 336-343; No. 4 by I. Löw, *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für den Orient*, XII, No. 5, p. 98-99, and by Schorr in *החלוץ*, XIII, 47-93, where besides some scurrilous attacks, useful notes are found; No. 5 by Bacher, *REJ.*, XXIV, 307-318, XXV, 143-144; by Porges, *ib.*, 145-151; and by Neubauer, *JQR.*, IV, 490-494; for No. 10 cf. S. Fraenkel *JQR.*, XVI, 576-578. Yet these small omissions do not in any way take away from our obligation to the compiler of the bibliography, who had a very hard task before him, as every student who has done similar work will realize. Only in one general point could an improvement have been effected, which would have made this bibliography more useful. A Hebrew indication of the contents of the 140 Russian items would have made this list much more valuable to those who, like the present writer, are unacquainted with that language. This bibliography was compiled by D. Maggid and revised and completed by S. Poznański who, though not figuring on the title-page, seems to have taken the greatest share in editing the volume, as in the notes we meet with additions by him to many of the different articles.

The Hebrew part of the volume is opened by two biblical articles. Halévy contributes an essay on dramatic stories in the Bible (ספורים תפעוליים בכתבי הקדש, I, 1-16), dealing from this point of view with Job which he divides into 6 acts, the marriage of Hosea into 8 acts, the story of Jonah into 6 acts, I Kings 20, 35-43, and Canticles 2, 8-17. The late M. Friedmann gives his suggestive explanations מאיר עין on Hosea (I, 17-34). Apocryphal literature is represented by Israel Lévi's article *Le chapitre III de Ben Sira* (II, 1-5) opening the non-Hebrew part, and Chajes on the book of Judith (II, 105-111). Lévi points to the artificial and mechanical arrangement of Ben Sira, by putting 3, 1-15 opposite 3, 16-28 and showing that 1-12 correspond to 16-26, and that the verses 27-28 which have no connection with

the preceding, form a parallel to 13-15. Chajes puts together the evidence tending to show that the book of Judith was written in the Maccabæan period as a romance, with the purpose of encouraging the people. He believes that the name Judith was taken for the heroine in memory of Judas Maccabæus. Several passages mention the fact that the Temple had been lately cleaned and purified. The event which serves as a basis for the story of Judith and Holophernes, according to Chajes, is the defeat and death of Nicanor and he points to a number of interesting parallels between the account of I Maccabees 7, 26 ff., and the Book of Judith. Chajes, likewise, points to a few interesting haggadic parallels and tries to strengthen the theory of a Hebrew original by explaining two passages through mistakes in the Hebrew. Here his arguments are not very convincing.

To this period also belongs Kohler's essay on the Zealots (*Wer waren die Zeloten oder Kannaim?* II, 6-18), the patriotic Jewish party which Josephus so viciously misrepresents. Kohler puts the respective passages and sources together and discusses them.

Larger space is given to the early Jewish exegetes. In the first place, with regard to the early translations, Margolis, who has devoted much of his time to the study of the Septuagint, which has been rather neglected by Jewish scholars since the time of Frankel, gives a timely warning against the indiscriminate corrections of the Hebrew Bible on the basis of the Septuagint, the text of which in itself is often corrupt (טעיות סופרים בתרגום השבעים, I, 112-116). He points to the great number of variations which are merely corruptions of the text, and gives a number of instances in which only one MS. preserves the original text, while all others are corrupt or where the Septuagint in all of its MS. forms is faulty. It is very instructive to see (p. 113) what became of *ἐγγελα σελίσσια* Jeremiah 48, 34 (Septuagint 31, 34) where the translator left the Hebrew עגלת שלישיה untranslated, or how the text of Judith 9, 3 is improved by a slight correction (p. 115 f.).

To another old translation, the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, Landauer has devoted his contribution (*Ein interessantes Fragment des Pseudo-Jonathan*, II, 19-26) con-

taining a fragment of this Targum on the decalogue Ex. 20, 1-13. What gives this text a peculiar interest is that it forms part of an Onkelos MS. One might think that originally this MS. contained some version of the Palestinian Targum in which the gaps were filled out by Onkelos, but the learned editor informs us that the other leaves of the MS. contain the text of Onkelos to 25, 31-28, 8, and in these chapters all versions of the Palestinian Targum offer some differences from the official text of Onkelos. Landauer compares the text with all other versions, and discusses its peculiarities in form and contents.

Two pieces are published here, by the earliest original interpreter of the Bible, Saadia, concerning whom we owe so much new information to Harkavy's discoveries. Eppenstein's edition of the double introduction to his commentary on Psalms (...שתי הקדמות רב סעריה גאון, I, 135-160) and the longer commentary on the first four Psalms almost finishes the publication of Saadia's commentary on this book, which is found in seven dissertations, the eighth unfortunately not having been published as yet. Saadia's introduction was only known by a free German translation which the editor often corrected in his notes. Of Saadia everything ought to be published in the original, and the careful work of the editor will be accepted with satisfaction by all those interested in this many-sided and original Gaon.

The "Genizah-Fragment" (II, 91-94) from Elkan Adler's collection edited by the late Siegmund Fraenkel contains a leaf of Saadia's translation and commentary on Isaiah 20, 2 ff.; the commentary on the first verse is accompanied by a German translation.

A very valuable addition to the biblical studies of the classical Judeo-Arabic period of which relatively little has been published so far, are the contributions of Bacher and Israelsohn. Bacher's publication of the Arabic translation and commentary by Moses ha-Kohen Ibn Chiquitilla (...תרגום ערבי על ס' איוב עם ביאור ערבי, I, 221-272), as far as preserved in the Oxford MS. 125, is the more valuable as this is the first connected piece of the commentaries by this author that is published, Poznański in his monograph (Berlin 1895) having been able to collect only very few passages in the original Arabic among the 22 pages of

quotations (cf. also his additions *REJ.*, XLI, 45-61). Bacher establishes the authorship of Ibn Chiquitilla which Poznański had disputed. The MS. contains the works of two other authors, Saadia and an anonymous writer, besides Ibn Chiquitilla, and Bacher has used it for his excellent edition of Saadia's translation and commentary on Job and has published the anonymous piece in *JQR.*, XX, 31 ff. With the present publication, the whole MS. is completely edited. It does not unfortunately contain the complete translation and commentary of our author, but his translation of 600, and his commentary on 140, of 1070 verses. The translation is printed in larger type than the commentary; in an appendix the remnants of a third translation in the same MS. and a Hebrew translation of the short introduction are added to the edition.

His contemporary and antagonist, Ibn Bal'am, whose commentary on Jeremiah (פירוש על ס' ירמיה, I, 273-308) is published here for the first time by Israelsohn, is better known to us now since Steinschneider discovered a great part of his כתאב אלתרניה on the Pentateuch (the title was first established by Neubauer in his *Report on the Petersburg Collection*, Oxford, 1876, 4), and since Harkavy found his almost complete commentary on the Prophets נכת אלמקרא, and fragments of that on the Hagiographa. This is the fourth book on which his commentary is now accessible, Derenbourg having edited the one on Isaiah (1892) and Poznański that on Joshua and Judges (1903-6), both from Israelsohn's copy. Poznański has promised an edition of the rest of Ibn Bal'am's works, the explanation of the Pentateuch especially deserving to be known in full, as its author shows a rare combination of talmudic learning and grammatical training. Israelsohn has based his text on two MSS. which supply each others' deficiencies and adds in the notes useful references to sources and parallels as well as the later authors who utilized the work. Israelsohn is well known to the scholarly world by his excellent edition of Ibn Ḥofni's Arabic commentary on the end of Genesis published 23 years ago, and it is to be hoped that he will now be able to return to this field of studies, in which he has shown himself so thorough.

The late Salomon Buber, the famous editor of *Midrashim*, gives some excerpts of a commentary on Genesis which bears the title "Midrash" because it consists mainly of a collection of aggadic passages: דונמאות מן מדרש על ס' בראשית לרבי שמואל בן רבי נסים מסנות (I, 391-402). There is no introduction to this contribution, owing probably to the death of Buber. The editors of the volume ought to have added at least the necessary references. Samuel b. Nissim Masnut is well known as the author of a commentary on Job under the title *Majan Gannim* published by the editor of the present specimens (Berlin 1889) from an Oxford MS. He also wrote a commentary on Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles contained in a Vatican MS., and according to Brüll (*Centralanzeiger*, p. 35) on Proverbs. Of the commentary on Genesis nothing was previously known. Buber identified the author originally with a Samuel ben Nissim mentioned by Ḥarizi as living in Aleppo, and it is a curious coincidence that he acquired the MS. of the present work from that city. Yet Neubauer (*JQR.*, II, 527; comp. Bacher *REJ.*, XXII, 135 f.) has proved that the author was a Sicilian who lived in Toledo. The date given by Neubauer (15th Century) is based on a mistake of Assemani, Masnut having lived a century earlier (cf. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übersetzungen*, 851, n. 41). Bacher has given an excellent characterization of the author based on his commentary on Job (*REJ.*, XXI, 118-32). The excerpts published here do not add any new traits but simply give new examples of his method. As the twelve pages only cover the first two verses of Genesis, the whole work must be of considerable length. Buber adds the sources in his footnotes, and there are only few passages for which even this master of the Midrash could not trace the source (comp. notes 8, 16, 29, 78). Besides the sources used in his commentary on Job, מדרש חסר ויתיר (note 46) and Donnolo (note 80) are drawn upon. The additions of the author to the haggadic passages which he compiled, are not very numerous (notes 30, 42, 51, 57, 59, 79), but he sometimes combined different passages (note 62) and enlarged his texts (note 43). Of special interest are his quotations from the Targum. While he never mentions the name of Onkelos in his *Majan Gannim*, he here introduces

his Targum repeatedly with **ואמר אונקלוס** (notes 76, 88); besides **תרגום ירושלמי** (89, Genesis I, 2, different from known versions) he quotes **ת"ש** (77) that agrees with the fragmentary Targum, ed. Ginsburger (Berlin 1899), and adds another text from a **נ"א**. If the editor had lived to write an introduction he would probably have given more information about the Targum quotations in this work which seem to be very curious. He wrote to the present writer (Nov. 7, 1905) that he found in the MS. quotations from **ת"א = אחר תרגום** which do not refer to Onkelos, and **ת"ש = תרגום שני** which are neither in Pseudo-Jonathan nor in the fragmentary Targum. It would be worth while to examine carefully the quotations in the MS.

Lambert's contribution (**הביאורים הנמצאים בספר הלעזים**, I, 368-390) is a supplement to the splendid edition of the "Glossaire hébreu-français" which he published in 1904 in collaboration with Brandin. Lambert publishes here (p. 369-80) all the explanations to the Pentateuch and the five scrolls occurring in the MS. of the glossary, stating that these explanations are much more numerous on the other parts of the Bible, but that those presented are a fair specimen. These are followed by all the passages in which authors are quoted in the MS. (381-90). We do not get much new information, the quotations being mostly known from other sources. Yet this edition is valuable, showing the great influence of Menaḥem's dictionary (more than six of the ten pages of quotations are taken from it) even after the work of the Spanish school had become accessible to the author through the grammatical works of Ḥayyuj (it seems, in Ibn Chiquitilla's translation, comp. p. 388, l. 1, with ed. Nutt, p. 32 and ed. Dukes, p. 56), the dictionary of Parḥon, and the commentaries of Ibn Ezra. Next to him, Rashi is most often mentioned, other French commentators only very rarely. In the second part, the French glosses are added while they are omitted in the commentaries. We thus get some further specimens of the Hebrew spelling, while in the "Glossaire" only transliterations are given. This contribution leads us from exegetical to philological studies, to which the peculiar text belongs that is published by Παπαδοπουλος - Κεραμευς (II, 68-90), a Hebrew-Greek glossary to the Mishna forming part of the collection of the late

archimandrite Antonin, now in the Imperial Library at Petersburg. The leaf which is given in facsimile, contains almost the whole of **כלאים** and **שביעית**; the Greek equivalent is given opposite the Hebrew. It is perhaps desirable to add that, in the MS., the Greek is written in Greek, not in Hebrew letters. The editor devotes his attention in his Greek contribution to these glosses which he thoroughly discusses and declares to show a Cypriote dialect. The interest of this publication lies in the fact that we have no other documents of Greek-speaking Jews from the time from which this MS. dates. Leaving the Hellenistic literature out of account, we have only later translations of the Bible and liturgical poems.

A splendid piece of modern philological work is Immanuel Loew's essay on Aramaic names of snakes (II, 27-81). It is only part of a larger study. Loew gives some extracts of his material about the snake as a source of danger, as remedy, and in proverbs; then he discusses the general names for snakes and gives a full collection of all the forty names of snakes occurring in the different Aramaic literature including those Greek names that have been adopted (*Lehnwörter*) or transcribed into Aramaic (*Fremdwörter*). Loew shows here again as, in his "Aramäische Pflanzennamen," his remarkable acquaintance with Semitic as well as classic literatures, and his very wide reading. This contribution as well as his "Aramäische Fischnamen" published in "Orientalische Studien zu Ehren Noeldeke's" forms part of his long expected but not yet published Aramaic Zoology.

To archæology belongs an essay by Krauss (*Sklabefreiung in den jüdisch-griechischen Inschriften aus Südrussland*, II, 52-67) in which he discusses the manumission of slaves in the Judeo-Greek inscriptions of southern Russia, in a very interesting paper continuing the researches of Harkavy (**היהודים ושפתם**, **הסלאווים**, Wilna 1867, p. 77-97) and Derenbourg (*Notes Epigraphiques*, Paris, 1877, VI, 68-80). He discusses at length Levit. 27, 28 in the light of traditional references (comp. also D. Hoffmann's commentary *ad locum*), and the part of woman in the Temple services, and comes to the conclusion that possibly the consecration of the slave to the Synagogue is only a legal fiction for full manumission. For some points as the mention of heirs

and the remaining in Judaism, he might have found an interesting parallel in the deed of manumission of Fostat 1087 in the possession of Prof. Schechter, of which a facsimile is given in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, XI, 405. It reads: **בחמשה בשבה דהוא עשרין וחמשה יומין בירח אייר דשנת אלפא ותלת מאה ותשעין ושית שנין כמנינא דרגילנא ביה בפסטאט מצרים דעל נילוס נהרה מותבה אנא מדללה בת שלמה וכל שום דאית לי צביתי ברעות נפשי כד לא אניסנא אקנית לך נפשך לחירו אנת מכלוף וכל שום דאית לך דהות עבדי מן קדמת דנה וכדו שחרירית יתך וחרי[ר]יתך ושויתי יתך בן חורין הא את לעצמך הא את לנפשך ואית לך רשותא לשואה לך שם בישראל ולמיסב בת ישראל ולמיעל בקהלא דישראל כשאר חרורי ועלולי ולית לי רשותא ולא לירחאי בתראי ולא לכל דייתי מחמתי עלך ולא על בנך לשעבדא יתהון בשום מדעם ודן דיהוי לך מיני כתב שחרור ואגרת שבקין וגט חירותא כדת משה וישראל:**

אברהם ב"ר יצחק נ"ע
שלמה ביר' מבורך החבר נ"ע
צדקה בר נתנאל נ"ע
אברהם בר שלום נ"ע
משלם בר יפת נ"ע

The name of the lady who gave her slave freedom, **מדללה** (the spoiled one), is to be added to Steinschneider's list of Arabic names of Jews. Of the ceremony in the Synagogue mentioned in the Greek inscriptions there is no trace here. A formula for manumission is also contained in the Petersburg MS. of R. Hai's **כתאב תצניף בית רין** (IX, **חדשים גם ישנים**, Harkavy, this is missing in the Oxford MS. 2808; see Wertheimer, **גנוי ירושלים**, III, Introd. p. 3) and in the **ראב"ן** (ed. Prague, 1610, f. 140a) and elsewhere (cf. **ננסת הגדולה**, *Yoreh Deah*, Constantinople 1717, ch. 267, § 59-63).

For talmudic literature, in the first place, Ratner's study on the Baraita of Levi ben Sisi (**משנתו של לוי בן סיס**, I, 117-22) is to be mentioned. Ratner collects the remnants of it, which are expressly mentioned as forming part of that collection (**תני לוי במתניתיה**). He shows that this was an independent work, not an explanation and amplification of the Mishna as Halevy maintains (**דורות הראשונים**, II, 60). He also shows that the work was unknown to the Palestinian Talmud. It is to be regretted that he

intentionally (p. 117) excluded those Baraitas of Levi in the Babylonian Talmud simply introduced by תנן, לוי, which would have made the article much more valuable and conclusive. In p. Baba Mešia (p. 119) one would rather correct תני רבי לוי in תני רבי לוי (not in תני לוי) as this requires only a very slight change. תני לוי I find also in p. Giṭṭin 5, 3 (46d). In Baba Batra 52b (p. 120) the Sheeltot 139 read like Sherira: תני רב שרביא; p. 120-121 Schorr (החלוץ, XIII, 7) also accepts the reading מן רבי לוי in p. Kilaim I, 6. In his notes on the latter passage אהבת ציון וירושלים (Wilna 1907), 8, ff., Ratner has previously discussed Levi's Baraitas.

Margulies gives some new explanations to difficult passages in the Palestinian Talmud Sabbath (הערות אחדות על ירושלמי שבת), I, 123-129).

Blau publishes four leaves of an unknown collection of Tosafot on Ketubot (עלים אחרים בלתי נודעים מתוספות למסכת כתובות), I, 357-367) found in the binding of a book, and proves that the author was Rabbi Isaac ben Samuel (ר"י הזקן). He then discusses the Tosafot on Kīddushin ascribed to this author in the Wilna edition of the Talmud, and proves that they are not his. Lubetzki, the editor of ס' השלמה, in his בדקי בתים, 16-22, recognized these Tosafot to be part of the ספר השלמה. The two discussions supplement one another. בעל התשלום on Nedarim (f. 24b 61b) is Naḥmanides, not the author of ספר השלמה; ספר השלמה is also quoted 64a and Lubetzki corrects 9a בעל ש"ש and 39a בעל השלמה into בעל ה"ה. French words also occur 13a, 31a; 28b Rabbi Samuel (Ben Meir) is quoted. References to his work on other treatises are also found, 29b on Moed Kāton, 28a, 46a on Nedarim, on Ketubot, and Giṭṭin; also 12b, on Baba Batra 27b, and Niddah 13a. Such studies in the Tosafistic literature are not very frequently met with at present, but they are very useful throwing light on a literature which we only know in a later stage, and this is the only way in which we can find out the older strata.

Cowley's contribution deals with an earlier work on the Talmud, namely Samuel b. Ḥofni's Introduction to the Talmud (I, 161-163). He publishes the beginning of it, from a single leaf contained in the Bodleian, finally establishing the existence of this book. Prof. Schechter has discovered a large fragment

which he identified as the end of this work, and which he has kindly placed in my hands for publication. One will see from it that this introduction was on a much larger scale than that of Samuel Hanagid and that the latter may have utilized but certainly not translated it. The MS. of which Cowley gives the first leaf only contained an abridged text (מכתצר) and very closely agrees with the beginning of Samuel Hanagid's introduction. It is very peculiar that עקיבא ארתיות דר' verso, l. 19, is mentioned as Baraita between Mekilta and Sifra, though it occurs also in Samuel Hanagid's work, where S. Sachs wanted to omit ארתיות (see הפליט, pp. 43-44). Verso, l. 3-5, the source from which the gap is supplied ought to have been added (Eduyot I, 6).

This introduction is one of the sources for the history of the Gaonic period and the Babylonian academies with which Epstein deals with his usual thoroughness (מקורות לקורות הגאונים ושיבות) בבבלי, I, 164-174). He points for the first time to the difference between sources coming from Sura and those from Pumbeditha. From the latter academy we have only one historical work, but this belongs to the best historical sources in the whole Jewish literature, the letter of Sherira (which was translated into Hebrew, not edited according to a London MS., by Filipowski in the appendix to his edition of the יוהסין). One of the difficulties which Epstein finds, that R. Judah, Sherira's grandfather, who became Gaon in 906, should have been the secretary of a Gaon who died in 816, is easily solved. The MSS. of the Franco-German text of Sherira all have אבי אבן אבנו i. e. R. Judah's grandfather, and not R. Judah himself. As we know from the letter JQR., XVIII, 402 (comp. 769), Judah was the secretary of R. Zemah b. Paltoi. In the other case (Sherira, p. 39) בן בנו cannot be taken literally, but must mean descendant. (Comp. also Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 70-71.) Much more numerous, but also in a much worse state of preservation, are the sources coming from Sura, among which the Seder Tannaim we-Ammonaim takes the first place. The editions are more fully given in Steinschneider's "*Geschichtsliteratur*," § 11, and additions p. 173. About the close relations with a responsum of the Suran Gaon R. Amram comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 328-30, 305-8. That the date ל"תק for Rab's emigration to Babylon is a peculiarity of this

Suran source is very doubtful. Nissim in his *מפתח* 3a, has this date, and he in all probability followed the authority of Sherira's letter addressed to his father and so corroborates the evidence of all the MSS. Of R. Samuel b. Ḥofni's introduction to the Talmud (see above), unfortunately very little of historical value has come down to us. The first quotation discussed by Epstein does not belong to Samuel but to *ס' מתיבות* as shown elsewhere (see above p. 91). The second quotation occurs in a fuller form in some MSS. of Ibn Aḳnin's introduction; see *Ginse Nistaroth*, III, 107, and *MGWJ.*, 1875, 321. That the MS. Angelica 36 contains at the end of the *מבוא התלמוד* the passage about the privilege of Sura. Buber announced in *עברי אנכי*, XXII (1885, No. 13, p. 108), where he communicated some variations. I mentioned *ZfHB.*, IX, 140, that the same is found in a MS. of the Seminary Library (formerly Cod. Halberstam 446). About Nathan ha-Babli, comp. also Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, and my review in *ZfHB.*, XIII, 169-70. Epstein believes that his MS. was used by Shullam as the basis for his edition of Sherira and the anonymous *סדר הישיבות*. I have proved in *ZfHB.*, V, 58, that Shullam used the text from which MS. Epstein was copied. A very interesting discovery Epstein made in Abraham b. David's *Sefer ha Ḳabbalah*. He shows that he utilized Suran sources for the earlier generations of the Geonim and only in the later times followed Sherira. All the discrepancies thus find their explanation.

To the Gaonic period to a large extent also belongs one of the most important contributions to the Jubilee-volume, viz: Poznański's collection of all the Kairwan scholars hitherto known (*אנשי קירואן*, I, 175-220). This summary of earlier and recent discoveries and publications will prove very helpful to all who are interested in the period of the decentralization of Jewish learning. Poznański begins with a survey of the Gaonic responsa known to be directed to Kairwan and practically all other references. The list consists of 45 names, several of which are only known as witnesses. I may supplement the additions already made by me in a review of the reprint of the essay in *ZfHB.*, XIII, 74-5, by a few addenda:

About Abraham ibn Aṭa (No. 7) cf. now Dr. Davidson's interesting article in which the poem of Hai Gaon is reproduced

in a corrected form together with a new poem in honor of Ibn Aṭa who is identified with Abraham b. Nathan (No. 6); above p. 231 ff., esp. p. 236. In corroboration of this identification Dr. Poznański in a letter to Dr. Davidson points to the fact that נתן is the Hebrew equivalent for the Arabic عטא.—P. 194 Ḥananel wrote also commentaries to other biblical books. In the פרושים שונים על ס' ישעיה ed. Halberstam, *Letterbode*, VII, explanations are quoted on Isaiah 6, 13; 10, 13; 21, 5; 31, 2; 40, 20; 41, 22; 42, 3, 8, 14; 43, 22; 45, 4, 16, 49, 1; 53, 2 (also in Neubauer, *The 53rd Chapter*, p. 335); 54, 1; 57, 16; 59, 15; 60, 19; 61, 1, 6; 63, 1; 65, 1; on Hosea 11, 10 *ib.* p. 34; quotations from other books may possibly occur in Cod. Paris 217.—P. 195 the laws of slaughtering by R. Ḥananel are quoted also by R. Judah b. Nathan in his new הלכות שחיטה MS. of the Seminary in New York (see *REJ.*, LIX, p. 221, note). To the four responsa of R. Ḥananel mentioned by Rapaport (התרומה ס' XVI, Itṭur 8c, ראב"ן, § 242, Azulai, שו"ת ברכה, Appendix to יוסף (ברכי יוסף) to 205, ed. Leghorn, 1774, f. 210 b), Poznański adds a few more. Besides two in Itṭur I 36c and 44c, I notice 11 in the הלכות קצור שבלי הלכות MS. of the Seminary Library. Müller intended to publish these responsa as they were copied for him in Ramsgate (*Report of the Montefiore College*, 1893, 9-10). One of them, as Poznański points out (p. 196, note 1), is ascribed to Rashi in חופש מטמונים [and in פרס f. 23c, ed. Warsaw, f. 59a].—About המקצועות ס' Zunz gave some important references in *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 252. Besides מרדכי, ראב"ה, and אסופות ס'. R. Ephraim of Bonn ascribed it to R. Ḥananel (*JQR.*, III, 342). He also quotes it in Responsa of R. Meir of Rothenburg, ed. Lemberg, No. 318. For further contradictions between המקצועות ס' and R. Ḥananel comp. also Gross, *R. Elieser b. Joel Halevi*, p. 52, note 1. As proof for the German origin of the compilation P. might have referred to passages like that which R. Isaac b. Hayyim found in his grandfather's שו"ת ר' חיים אור זרוע (No. 14, f. 7b and הפרנס 125). Gaonic quotations from המקצועות ס' (p. 197) also occur in אור זרוע on Baba Ḳamma No. 347, 373, 390.—P. 198. In החלון V, § 42-3, Schorr shows that R. Ḥananel sometimes follows the Palestinian Talmud against the Babylonian. *Ib.* note

1. In the only case in which R. Ḥananel says: **וכן קבלנו מרבינו** **האי ז"ל** (on Sukkah 37b) the reading is rather doubtful. Ibn Ghiat I, p. 112, and Manhig, p. 69a, read instead **למרבינו האב ז"ל** which Bamberger in his notes to the former place refers to R. Ḥushiel: Meiri (**מנן אבות**, p. 144) had the reading **מאבותי**, while others like Ittūr II, 40a, and **רא"ש** agree with the edition.—To the quotations from Hai Gaon in R. Ḥananel's commentaries p. 195, n. 1, Pesahim 107b is to be added. R. Ḥefez b. Jazliah, as Poznański points out, probably does not belong here, as there really are no proofs for his having been in Kairwan. In a letter which I hope to publish shortly in the *JQR.*, the **כתב המצות למרב חפץ האלוף בן יצליח האשורי** is mentioned, which seems to indicate that he was a native of Mosul (?). According to the editor, the **מצות ס' האשכול**, III, 61, is the work of R. Ḥefez, but compare Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 179. The **מצות ס' חפץ האשכול**, according to the introduction p. xx, cannot be found, nor does it occur in the MSS., as Mr. Albek informs me. For the **תפסיר אלא לפאט מפיטום הקטרת** cf. Kaufmann, *REJ.*, V, 315. The corrections offered p. 27, note 1, have already been given by Steinschneider in *MGWJ.*, XXXIV (1885), 288. The **סמ"ק** does not quote R. Ḥefez; the passage given by Poznański in confirmation of this is found in the **ליקוטים מרבינו מאיר מרוטנבורק** at the end of paragraph 82 (not 81), and is identical with **תשב"ץ** 412 mentioned immediately after it. To the collection of quotations from Sefer Ḥefez, 28, note 1, may be added Or Zarua, Baba Batra 99. Ephraim of Bonn (Resp. of R. Meir b. Baruch, ed. Lemberg, 318, mentioned here in the name of R. Meir), R. Meir b. Baruch (Resp. ed. Prague, No. 175, 307), Abraham ben Nathan (Manhig) 61a, 67a, **ר' חפץ גאון** (comp. D. Cassel, *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, 131), **שבמ"ה** (Cod. British Museum Or. 1389, *MGWJ.*, IV (1853), 104); Mordecai also quotes it Ketubot IX, § 334; *Commandments*, No. 111, has a passage occurring also in **מתיבות ס'** and contradicting R. Ḥananel (cf. above p. 92). It ought to be mentioned that some of the excerpts in Or Zarua contain quotations of Gaonic responsa, e. g. Baba Ḳamma 281, 284; Baba Batra 78 = **תשב"ץ** 569, R. Meir b. Baruch Resp. 307; I 167a, § 615 and Baba Mešia 38, quotes the Pal. Talmud; Baba Ḳamma 381 contains a marginal note (**גליון**) of

Sefer Hefez.—P. 202, No. 22. For R. Judah ben Joseph see now Davidson (above p. 237, 244-46). He might be the son of the Joseph b. Judah (מ"ר יוסף בן אבי זכריא) mentioned as correspondent of Sherira and Hai in Beth Talmud, III, 64, but the parallel passage in Responsa of R. Solomon ben Adret, V, 121 (Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I 187) reads משה בן אבי שכם. A יוסף בן מר רב יהודה is quoted by Ibn Ghiat, II, 90.—P. 203, No. 24, in Cod. Oxford 2877⁹ Joseph and Nissim the sons of Berechiah occur; perhaps Joseph is the one discussed here. That Nahshon was a brother of Joseph (p. 204) is also the opinion of Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IX 129.—P. 209, about Meborak comp. also Abr. Klausner, *Minhagim*, 9a, Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 192.—P. 212. R. Abraham b. Isaac אב"ר saw in Barcelona the מפתח of R. Nissim Resp. MS. No. 604, Gross, *MGWJ.*, 1868, 281; Sachs, כבוד הלבנון, VI, 167; ארחות חיים, I, 15b, § 28, quotes בעל המפתח. It is doubtful whether the מפתחות used by R. Shilah b. Isaac of Siponte (Ittur I, 14c) is the work of Nissim.—P. 215. Responsa of R. Nissim are also quoted by Meiri (מן אבות, 146-47) and Nahmanides on Baba Batra 52b.—P. 216. On Nissim's Siddur see Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 19, note d, and the passages quoted there. Manhig 81b also quotes מגלת סתרים, but the references to the title are misplaced, comp. Zunz, *l. c.*, Cassel, *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, p. 132.

One of the Kairwan savants discussed by Poznański also occurs elsewhere in this volume. Goldziher publishes from the Arabic Genizah-Collection of the late David Kaufmann, a large fragment of a treatise on the names and attributes of God (*Ein anonymes Traktat zur Attributenlehre*, II, 95-114), which is dedicated to Abraham ibn Aṭa, a physician to whom high praise is given and whom he identifies with the Kairwan correspondent of R. Hai. The passage in question is translated into German, p. 99, and shows that the author lived far away from Ibn Aṭa; the latter showed great interest in the academies and helped support them. The editor therefore suggests that the anonymous writer lived in Babylonia. He was evidently a contemporary of Hai and his work belongs to the earliest philological writings among the Jews coming immediately after Saadia, so far as is

known at present. The author, as Goldziher points out, belongs to the school of the Mutazilites.

Passing from philosophy to theology, Grünhut (I, 403-413) deals with a book which must have enjoyed very great popularity as there are at least 20 MSS. of it known, the *מראות אלֹהים* by R. Ḥanok b. Salomon al-Ḳonstantini (cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Berlin*, II, 97, No. 2051). Yet it is very little quoted; Grünhut only knows of its use and abuse by Abrabanel. How this enhances the value of the book (p. 410) is hard to understand. That Abrabanel sometimes made use of the book without mentioning it, is a fresh example of his well known method of treating his sources. Besides some quotations in his *Alfarabi* (see index *s. v. Chanoch*) Steinschneider gave a note of the book in *HB.*, XII, 108-109, analyzing the introduction of which Grünhut offers fuller extracts. Besides the authors put together, p. 403, the work is also mentioned by Heilprin in his *Seder ha-Dorot* and De Rossi in his biographical dictionary. On the *מנלה עמוקות* of Solomon al-Ḳonstantini (p. 409) cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Berlin*, II, 62-3, Cod. 211-12, who states that according to the Vatican MS. this book was finished *בסלו* 113 (1352) in *ברנש*, probably Burgos. Steinschneider also believes this Solomon to be the father of Ḥanok. On the family of al-Ḳonstantini, cf. Steinschneider in *JQR.*, XII, 205-8.

Mediæval Hebrew poetry is well represented in the present volume by a contribution by Brody, the best authority on this subject (*מטמני מסתרים מחברת ב': ס' הענק לר' יהודה אֶלְחַרְיִזִּי*, I, 309-56). He publishes the *ס' הענק* of Ḥarizi from the unique Oxford MS. The author in all probability is the famous poet of the *Tahkemoni*, the previous doubts of the editor having been removed. The poem is like the *ענק* of Moses ibn Ezra, a play with homonyms, several verses always ending with the same word in different meanings. The author, as Brody points out, avoids all those homonyms utilized by Moses ibn Ezra and the anonymous poet of whose work Brody has published a considerable fragment in *Hakadem*, II, and therefore only seldom is able to give more than two verses finishing with the same word. The editor gives the meter before each of the 257 groups of verses and on the bottom of the page adds the necessary refer-

ences to the text which gives new evidence of the poetical talent of the great Spanish poets.

Markon's description of the ritual of Kaffa in the Crimea (מאמר על אדות מחזור מנהג כפא, I, 449-469) with a list of the religious poets and poems it contains is also a useful contribution to the history of Hebrew poetry. I have dealt with this more fully elsewhere (*OLZ.*, XII, 448-9).

Steinschneider's contribution (*Zeitgenossen des Moses ibn Ezra und Jehuda ha-Levi*, II, 126-136) which was written at very short notice half a year before the death of the great master, gives a list of all the contemporaries (104) that occur in the works of Moses ibn Ezra and Judah ha-Levi, who formed a kind of literary circle which deserved a special investigation with attention to the non-Jewish surroundings. In the suggestive introduction which in no way shows the advanced age of the writer, Steinschneider points to four other similar circles of poets, one in Provence towards the end of the 14th Century, one in northern Spain in the 15th Century, one in Salonica 1570-90, and finally one in Yemen in the 17th Century.

Another historical communication is, strange to say, almost the only one in the volume dealing with Harkavy's favorite subject of Karaism. Gottheil publishes "A Decree in favor of the Karaites of Cairo dated 1024," (II, 115-125) the oldest document in the archives of that community. Unfortunately the beginning of the text is missing and therefore not everything is clear. No names occur in the part preserved and the cause for granting the present decree to protect the Karaites against interference by their opponents can only be inferred. The text has been published before in an entirely unknown Karaitic journal *At-Tahdib* appearing in Cairo 1901-5. Gottheil has also published a later but more extensive Karaitic document from the same source in *The Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of Harper* (p. 386-414) and a Rabbinical document of the Eleventh Century in *JQR.*, XIX, 472-8. Jewish documents from Cairo of this period are not as rare as Gottheil believes (p. 117), as one can see, e. g., by glancing through Worman's instructive article in *JQR.*, XVIII, 7 ff.

A document which throws light on the conditions of the Polish Rabbis and communities in the 18th Century, is reprinted by Freimann from an extremely rare booklet (תקע שופר 'ס, I, 414-442). It is a protest of Jehizkiah Joshua Feibel Teomim against the congregation of Przemyśl, which had taken away his rabbinate in spite of the protests of the Council of the Four Lands and other authorities, and the obligations they had towards him. The editor gives all the necessary information in the introduction and notes. Comp. also *ZfhB.*, XIII, 66-68.

A letter of considerable significance for the history of the founder of Ḥasidism (לקורות החסידות... I, 443-448) is published by his latest biographer Abraham Kahana who discusses all the points of interest. It is written by a brother-in-law of Israel Baal Shem Tob in 1747 from Hebron, and speaks of conditions there and in Jerusalem.

Jaré gives some biographical dates about Ḥananel Nepi, (לקוטים) מכתבי הרב חננאל נפֿי (I, 470-83), some specimen of his halakic correspondence, and some notes from the MS. of his well-known biographical dictionary that was published miserably and with many omissions, the most notable of which is the biography of Azariah de Rossi, published here by Jaré with some other passages. Ghirondi, it seems, had omitted this biography purposely as he objected to the critic (see the forthcoming edition of Steinschneider's *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 25).

The letters of Rapaport, Jost, S. Sachs, Bodek, and Lebensohn to Reggio published by Berliner (רובב שפתי ישנים I, 484-504), give some side-lights to the history of Jewish science in 1830-45 and the difficulties the editors of periodicals encountered at the time. Rapaport's letters deal to a great extent with his relations to the over-sensitive Luzzatto who could not be induced to put his attacks on Maimonides and Ibn Ezra in a milder form, and only with difficulty agreed to omit some love-poems of Moses Ibn Ezra "which were of such kind that even Gentiles would blame us for them." On the whole we do not get much new information out of these letters, as they deal with conditions that are well-known from the published correspondence of Luzzatto, Rapaport, etc., yet they add some new traits to the picture and one is glad to read once more, e. g., of the rôle the bookseller

Schmid in Vienna played as a mediator between the Italian and the Austrian and German scholars.

Lewin contributes an essay on the Jews of Kalisch (*Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Juden in Kalisch*, II, 141-178) where a Jewish community is mentioned as early as 1287. After putting briefly together all that is known of the political relations of this community, Lewin enumerates all the rabbis of this city in chronological order from 1647 to 1903, adding all necessary information about their literary activity. An alphabetical list of other prominent men of Kalisch, rabbis in other communities, scholars, physicians, printers, etc., concludes this contribution to the history of the Jews in Poland.

Schwab who in his valuable "*Rapport*" of 1904 had given a full collection of all Jewish epitaphs found in France, adds a new inscription found in Paris after the publication of his "*Rapport*" ("*Une Épitaphe Parisienne inédite*," II, 137-140). He approximately fixes the date at the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th Century for palæographical reasons. As such stones were often carried away from their places and used for buildings, it seems rather hazardous to venture the hypothesis that the single stone found in the foundation of a house should prove the existence of a third cemetery in Paris.

One of the most suggestive essays contained in the present volume is Bornstein's study on the Calendar in the Assuan Papyri (פליטה מני קרם, I, 63-104). Bornstein who is a specialist on the very complicated history of the Jewish calendar submits all the dates occurring in these papyri to a thorough investigation which leads him to supply some of the lacunae differently from the editors. Thus he reads in B 17th of Tot, instead of 7th; in D, 21st of Masora instead of first; in G 24 of Tishri (לחשרי), in I, 9th Year of Darius instead of 8th on the basis of his calculations and with comparison of the facsimiles. He shows his familiarity with all the most recent researches in the chronology of the Oriental peoples which he utilizes. He reaches the conclusion that the fixing of the calendar in the time of the papyri took place in the same way as the Talmudic literature, observation being checked to some degree by calculation. In an appendix, Bornstein discusses the expression יום עבורו של חדש which,

according to his opinion, the Palestinians understand to mean the 31st day of the month, the Babylonians the 30th; the intercalations of the Babylonians, the Karaitic views on determining the length of the month, etc. Incidentally it may be mentioned that, p. 100, note 1, Bornstein corrects the text of Maimonides' commentary on Mishna Rosh hashana II קצת חשבון קצת הראיה into קשת, which literally agrees with the Arabic original (*Hildesheimer-Jubelschrift*, p. 99), מקדאר קום אלרוייה, while the editor, M. Friedlaender, incorrectly translates קצת שיעור הראיה.

Another article dealing with questions of calendar is that of Sarsowski about the Canaanitic names of the months in their relations to the Babylonians (שמות החדשים הכנענים ביחוסם להבבלים, II, 35-62) an Assyriological study which is entirely outside of the line of the reviewer. A lengthy account of the article may be found in *OLZ.*, 511-15.

There remains only to be mentioned Baron Günzburg's essay (II, 130-134), of a more miscellaneous character than the rest of the volume, but the title of which, והנה טוב מאד, might be well applied to the whole of the collection.

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America

ALEXANDER MARX

SOME NOTES ON "JEWISH ARABIC STUDIES"

IN his interesting article on the above mentioned subject in the October number of this REVIEW, Prof. I. Friedlaender has thrown much light on the history of Jewish sectarianism and stimulated further study in the same field. He suggests (p. 187) the reading *Almuḳammis*. Steinschneider (*Die Arab. Literatur der Juden*, 37) reads *Almīkmas* (מקמץ and אלמקמאץ). There cannot, however, be any doubt that the name was *Al-Muḳammas*, the *ḥ* in the one form being *mater lectionis*. אלמקמץ is also the reading in the little fragment of his work: "Fifty queries in refutation of the Christians," which I published *JQR.*, XV, 682.

As to the name *Serene* (p. 211), Dr. Friedlaender's derivation from *suryāni* is more ingenious than probable and cannot supplant the derivation given by Graetz from *Serenus*. The name was known to Arabs considerably earlier. A Copt slave-girl of the name of *Sirīn* was given by Mohammed to the poet *Hassān b. Thābit*. Lastly Mohammed b. *Sirin* (born A. H. 33) was one of the fathers of Mohammedan tradition (see *Ibn Khallīḳan*, translated by De Slane, II, 586), the first author of a work on interpretation of dreams (see *JQR.*, XV, 175).

It is hardly appropriate to call the Jewish tribes of the B. *Ḳainoḳa*, *Al Nadhir*, and *Kheibar* "sons of the desert, men of the sword, soldiers, warriors" (p. 210) and "ignorant nomads" (p. 212). What we know from the early Arab sources points to the contrary. They were rather peaceful palm growers, craftsmen, and traders who lived in settled habitations round *Medina* and further north. The quarrels of which Arab authors have so much to relate should not be taken too seriously. Anyway we never read of Jewish victories, but only of defeat and slaughter.

There may have been a few warriors among them, but their pure Jewish blood is a matter of doubt. As to their alleged ignorance, such evidence as we possess does not bear out this statement (see my *New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Qoran*, 103 ff.). The art of writing was much practised among them. They did not, indeed, produce any scholars, but they had a good knowledge of the Bible which they publicly interpreted in a Midrās. They even seemed to have used an Aramaic version of the Pentateuch. This can be gathered from the Aramaic forms of many Jewish expressions which appear in the Qorān. They were well versed in the Haggadah of which ample evidence exists in the Qorān and Sunna. Even the new poem by Al Samau'al, the prototype of an Arabicized Jew, has several haggadic elements (see *JQR.*, April, 1905). Ibn Khaldūn on whom Dr. Friedlaender relies, even if we absolve him from religious bias, was no judge of Jewish learning, and on the proficiency of the Jews in Arabia eight centuries before his time he is no authority at all. Geiger, too, has misjudged this point completely. Dr. Friedlaender is not, therefore, justified in maintaining that the Arab Jews could not have promoted a new religious movement. Why not? Surely they did so, first indirectly, then directly. Without the positive knowledge they imparted to its founder, it is doubtful whether Islam would have seen the light.

London

H. HIRSCHFELD

A REPLY

The courtesy of the Editors has enabled me to see the above note before its publication and to reply to it in a few words:

I did not "suggest" the reading al-Muḳammiṣ (with *i*). In the passage referred to I merely discussed the bearing of the variant al-Muḳammiṣ (with *s* instead of *ṣ*) on a conjecture of Harkavy. The pronunciation al-Muḳammas (with *a*) which Dr. Hirschfeld prefers is just as acceptable to me.

The name Sirīn is, of course, quite familiar to me, but Serene can have nothing to do with it. For the name of our sectarian is written שִׁרְיָי, and whether my derivation from *Suryānī* be correct or not, it is undoubtedly a *Nisbe* and indicates, as in the case of the other sectarians, a place.

The description of the Arabian Jews as "sons of the desert, men of the sword, soldiers, warriors" is a quotation from Graetz for which I am not responsible. I deserve, however, Dr. Hirschfeld's criticism for having spoken of the Jews of Arabia as "nomads." This mistake, in which I must have been unconsciously influenced by Graetz, is the more grievous as in the same volume of the REVIEW (p. 251) I myself emphasized the settled condition of the Arabian Jews. As to whether these Jews were ignorant or not, depends entirely on the standard that is applied to them. The Jews of Arabia, to be sure, knew more of Judaism than did the Arabs who were deeply influenced by them, but they were ignorant, when compared with the Jews of Babylonia. In the same way I referred in my article (p. 208) to the ignorance of the Persian Jews who in point of Jewish knowledge were I have no doubt in no way inferior to the Jews of Arabia.

However, all this does not affect the main issue. My object was to show that the rise of Jewish sectarianism in the lands of

Islam was due to a similar process within the Mohammedan community and to prove, against Graetz, that the Arabian Jews, who in their native land submitted to the authority of the Geonim (see my note "The Jews of Arabia and the Gaonate" this REVIEW, 249 ff.) and outside of it do not seem to have attained to any influence, cannot have been responsible for a movement defying the acknowledged authorities and bearing the impress of an entirely different environment. This thesis I fully and unwaveringly uphold. The close resemblance between this form of Jewish sectarianism and the corresponding heterodox tendencies in Islam which will be brought out in detail in the continuation of my "Studies" will I believe convince even the most sceptical. I am happy to say that, without these additional proofs, my theory which was in the main anticipated by Harkavy (comp. p. 185 of my article) has found the unqualified approval of men like Nöldeke, Goldziher, and Barth.

New York

ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER

SHEM TOB BEN JOSEPH PALQUERA

II

HIS "TREATISE OF THE DREAM" (אגרת החלום)

PUBLISHED FOR THE FIRST TIME FROM A MS. IN THE BRITISH
MUSEUM

BY HENRY MALTER, Dropsie College

AMONG the difficulties that beset the way of every investigator in the field of Jewish literature, especially that of the Middle Ages, the one arising from misleading titles is not the least perplexing. The multiplicity and variety of books bearing the same title, although entirely different in origin, content, and purpose, which are met with in mediæval Hebrew literature, can hardly be paralleled in any of the world's literatures. The underlying cause of this confusion is the peculiar fondness of Hebrew authors for pompous titles for their productions, titles that often have no relation whatever to the subject-matter of their works. The choice of title depended mostly upon the individual author's taste or whim, and the same predilections were often shared by a number of others. Moreover the existence of a book bearing a given name did not prevent an author from appropriating the title for his work. As a result we have, for example, under the name of "Tree of Life," twenty-five books (see Benjacob's *Thesaurus*, s. v. עץ חיים), assignable to twelve different branches of Jew-

ish literature. Equally illustrative of the lack of relationship between title and work are five books bearing the name **שושנת יעקב** ("Lily of Jacob"). Three of them deal with halakic matter, one is devoted to palmistry and physiognomy, and the third undertakes to show "means by which to ascertain any number that another person may be thinking of and other tricks for fun and amusement, also ways of writing and speaking by signs so as not to be understood by any one except those who know the signs."

I. S. Reggio¹ was of the opinion that these symbolic titles were adopted by Jewish writers under the dominating influence of Arabic literature. This may be the explanation in the case of some authors who followed Arabic models²; it is not, however, borne out by the facts when applied to Jewish literature in general. The Arabs usually employed rimed titles, a practice not commonly adopted by the Jews.³ Moreover, symbolic titles occur first and are found mainly in the literature of the Halakah, a branch least influenced by Arabic literature. It is in the domain of Halakah that we meet as early as the twelfth century titles giving no indication of the character of the books, e. g. **ספר העטור** by Isaac b. Abba Mari of Marseille (1179-89), **אור זרוע** by Baruch b. Isaac of Worms (1200), **ס' התרומה**

¹ Quoted by Prof. Schechter in his excellent essay on the subject under discussion, *Studies*, I, 277.

² For instance Moses Ibn Ezra's **ערוגת הבשם**, or Abraham Ibn Ezra's **ערוגת החכמה ופרדס המזמה**.

³ There are some exceptions, as the title of the second work mentioned in the preceding note, that of Abraham b. Ḥiyya's *Ethics* which is in full: **הגיון הנפש העצובה. בדפקה דלתי התשובה. ועל דלתותיה נצבה**, etc. (comp. Luzzatto in *Kerem Chemed*, VII, 77; S. Sachs, *היונה*, 72), and of his mathematical Encyclopædia: **יסודי התכונה ומגדל האמונה**, of which only a fragment is extant; see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, VII, 84 ff.; *Bibliotheca Mathematica*, 1896, p. 34; *JQR.*, XVI, 743.

by Isaac b. Moses of Vienna (1250). Subsequently this custom spread to all other branches of Hebrew literature, as the instances given show.

There is another class of titles which are still more misleading. The words forming the title would seem to be descriptive of the work; on examination, however, it turns out that the promise of these "descriptive" titles is in no way fulfilled by the books that bear them. Thus from the title "Voice of Song" (קול זמרה) we might well expect poetry. Instead, the book is an obscure kabbalistic commentary on the *כוונות* of Isaac Loria. A book styled *למכה רפואה* "Balm for the Wound," the author of which is presumably a physician, turns out to be a commentary on Canticles. These instances which could be readily multiplied, suffice to show that the Hebrew bibliographer can not classify Hebrew books without going beyond their titles.

The foregoing observations were suggested to the writer by his experience with the title of the treatise here published for the first time from a unique manuscript in the British Museum, Add. 27,144 (Margoliouth, *Descriptive List of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, London, 1893, p. 83). The manuscript belonged originally to the Italian bibliophile Joseph Almanzi, upon whose death (1860) it was bought with many other manuscripts of Almanzi's collection for the British Museum. The author of the work, Shem Tob ben Joseph Palquera, mentions it in his commentary on Maimonides' *Guide*, called *מורה המורה* (Pressburg 1837, p. 131), under the name *אגרת החלום*.⁴ This is the only reference to our

⁴ Comp. my article on Palquera in the October number of this REVIEW (p. 172, n. 37).

treatise found in the numerous works of Palquera, and it has always been described among the writings of this author as an exposition on the nature of dreams⁵. Even Steinschneider, the greatest Hebrew bibliographer, suggested (*Jewish Literature*, London 1857, p. 371, n. 78) that "the monograph **אגרת החלום** of Shemtob Palquera, only known by his own quotation, was probably philosophical, according to the principles which the Arabs and Jews drew from Aristotle's '*De Somno et Vigilia*'".⁶ When, however, S. D. Luzzatto published his "Bibliothèque de feu Joseph Almanzi" (*Hebr. Bibliographie*, vols. IV-VI) where the superscription of the present treatise of Palquera is given (VI, 19, No. 251), Steinschneider at once realized his mistake. In a note referring to the book he says: "ce libre est le **אגרת החלום**, v. Catal. p. 2539 et *Jewish Literature*, p. 371, où j'ai supposé qu'il s'agit d'une oneiro-critique." As long as no manuscript of the **אגרת החלום** was known, the only information about the work was the passage in Palquera's commentary on the *Guide* referred to above. This passage dealt with the reliability of dreams,

⁵ So e. g. Jellinek in his Preface to **אגרת הוכוח**, and recently M. David in the Introduction to Palquera's **ראשית חכמה**, Berlin 1902, xi.

⁶ It is the peculiar fate of Palquera's works to have been the occasion for various misconceptions. Thus his encyclopædic work **דעות הפילוסופים** (as yet unpublished) was ascribed by Steinschneider and others to Samuel Ibn Tibbon, until Zunz (*Hebr. Bibl.*, IX, 135 f.) restored it to its real author; see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 5. His **צרי היגון** was attributed by some to one Saul b. Simon; see the article on Palquera in the October number, p. 173, n. 42. The author of the article "Philosophical Ethics," *JE.*, V, 254, informs us that Palquera "wrote four works on various ethical questions," among which he enumerates **ראשית חכמה**—a work which is in fact, as the title indicates, a general introduction to all secular sciences. On the other hand, Palquera's real book on ethics, the **אגרת המוסר**, is not mentioned at all. Of the four works mentioned there, only one, the **ספר המעלות**, represents a system of ethics.

and no other inference could be drawn than that the work was devoted to oneirocriticism. Palquera quotes there the Arabic philosopher Averroes' defense of the Peripatetics against the accusation that they denied God's foreknowledge of particulars. The text reads: "How is it possible to ascribe to the Peripatetics the view that God's eternal knowledge does not extend to the particular, for do they not assert elsewhere that true dreams' contain predictions of particular future events and that these predictions are communicated to man in sleep by the eternal all-guiding and all-dominating mind? It is not only with regard to particulars that the Peripatetics claim that God's knowledge differs in kind from human knowledge, but also with regard to the universals; for our universal notions, like our particular ideas, are the results of the world of phenomena, while the opposite is true of God's knowledge. This proves conclusively that the divine knowledge is too different from ours and the terms *universal* and *particular* cannot be applied to it at all."⁷ To these words of Aver-

⁷ החלומות הצורקים, אלרוויא אלצארקה, is a frequent phrase in Arabic and Hebrew literature to designate "true" dreams in contradistinction to false or meaningless dreams; comp. Munk, *Mélanges*, 95, n. 1. Al-Gazzali devotes a whole chapter of his *Maḳāṣid 'ul-Falāsifat* to the discussion of such dreams; comp. the writer's *Abhandlung des Abu Ḥāmid Al-Gazzālī*, Frankf. a. M. 1896, p. 1x; A. F. Mehren, *Vues théosophiques d' Avicenne*, Louvain 1886, 29 f.; Aaron b. Elijah, עין חיים, c. 98; Munk, *Guide*, I, 27, n. 1; II, 267, 282; n. 7; and Albo, *Iḳḳarim*, III, c. 9.

⁸ והיאך יחשבו (sc. החכם הנזכר, by which phrase Palquera always refers to Averroes; comp. his Introduction to the work in question, p. 8) והוא כה ההולכים שהם יאמרו שהוא ישתבח לא בידועה קדומה ידע הפרטים והם יראו החלום הצורך מזהיר בפרטים המתחדשים בזמן העתיד ושאותה הידיעה המוחרת תגיע לאדם בתנומה מוצד הידיעה הנצחית המנהגת לכל והמושלת עליו ואינם רואים שהוא ית' לא ידע הפרטים בלבד [אלא] ולא הכללים כי הכללים הידועים עלולים (so read!) כמו כן מטבע הנמצא [והדבר] באותה הידיעה בהפך ועל כן התבאר. Upon further במופת שאותה הידיעה מרוממת משיתואר בכללי ובפרטי. ע"כ

roes, Palquera adds: "Although to my mind this view in itself is undoubtedly correct, namely, that God's Providence embraces all existence, the subject of dreams, too, has convinced me of it; for the fact that particular events are foretold to many in dreams proves beyond doubt that Providence extends also to particulars. On this subject I have written a treatise, which I have called *אגרת החלום* "Treatise of the Dream," a work on education and conduct—something remarkable." * Assuming from the title

investigation I found the passage to be a verbal translation from Averroes' *Theology* published by Marcus Joseph Müller (*Philosophie und Theologie von Averroes*, Munich 1859, p. 11, l. 6-13): *وكيف بتوهم علي*

المشائين انهم يقولون انه سبحانه لا يعلم بالعالم القديم الجزئيات وهم يرون ان الرويا الصادقة تتضمن الانذارات بالجزئيات الحادثة في الزمان المستقبل وان ذلك العلم المنذر يحصل للانسان في النوم من قبل العلم الازلي المدبر للكل والمستولى عليه وليس يرون انه لا يعلم الجزئيات فقط على النحو الذي نعلمه نحن بل ولا الكلّيات فان الكلّيات المعلومة عندنا معلولة ايضاً عن طبيعة الموجود والامر في ذلك العلم بالعكس ولذلك ما قد ادعى اليه البرهان ان ذلك العلم منزّه عن ان يوصف بكلي او بجزئي

Averroes repeats the same in brief at the end of his work, p. 131. More than a hundred years before Averroes, the same view regarding God's knowledge was advanced by Al-Batlayūsi (died 1030); comp. Kaufmann, *Die Spuren Al-Batlayusis in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie*, Leipzig 1880, p. 49 f. As is well known, this theory of the incomprehensibility of the nature of the divine knowledge was accepted also by Maimonides, "Eight Chapters," c. 8, and *Guide*, III, 21; comp. Albo, IV, 3.

* ואומר כי עם היות אצלי זו האמונה אמתית אין אצלי ספק בה ולא פקפוק כלומר השגחת האלוך ית' בכל הנמצא בכללים ובפרטים אמת אותה אצלי ענין החלום כי מה שיווהו בו רבים מכני אדם על עניניהם הפרטים מורה בלי ספק כי ההשגחה בפרטים וכבר חברתי בזה הענין אגרת קראתי שמה אגרת החלום בענין מלחמות, IV, 6 (ed. Levi b. Gerson, הלמוד גם בענין משא ומתן מה שהוא פלא

and from the context that the work was an oneirocriticism, no satisfactory explanation of Palquera's words following that quotation could be found. Why should a work on the trustworthiness of dreams confine itself to the question of education and conduct? The closing phrase **מה שהוא פלא** is, moreover, unintelligible, as there is nothing to which it refers. All these obscurities are, however, cleared up by the superscription put at the head of the treatise by some copyist. Here the title **אגרת החלום** is dropped and the information is given that the writing of this treatise, dealing with ethics, was due to a dream. The ideas came to Palquera in a dream and on awakening he committed his dream to writing.¹⁰ This explains Palquera's reference to the work as the "Treatise of the Dream" and his explanatory remark that it deals with education and social conduct. The words **מה שהוא פלא** are thus only the expression of Palquera's own astonishment at his dream in which he sees additional evidence that God's providence extends also to individual affairs.

In all probability, the original title was **אגרת החלום**, as quoted by Palquera, perhaps with the sub-title **אגרת אונרת** **דרכי שלום ואמת**¹¹, which was followed by some sort of

Leipzig, 176-79) uses the same argument to prove God's providence over individuals; comp. also *ib.*, II, 2, and Shemtob b. Joseph, **דרשות**, Venice 1547, *fol.* 17c.

¹⁰ There is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement. This matter together with others relating to the present treatise will be taken up for detailed discussion in a series of articles which will appear in subsequent numbers of this REVIEW. In the following pages attention will be drawn to the articles in the notes on the respective passages by referring to this note.

¹¹ The phrase is taken from Esther 9, 30 and epitomizes the whole content of the treatise, **שלום** being interpreted as moral perfection, while **אמת** stands for the achievement of intellectual perfection (see below). On the usage of the expression **אונרת** in mediæval Hebrew literature comp. Harkavy, *Studien*, V, 118-120, 237, bottom. To his references this title of our treatise may now be added.

a preface, wherein the author related his experience in the dream. A later redactor of the treatise must have considered the title inadequate and the preface unimportant, and therefore epitomized the whole in the superscription before us. The editor's last words *וזאת התחלתה* are indicative of this procedure. The phrase, it seems, meant to assure the reader that *here* begins the treatise *proper*, of which he has omitted nothing.

We turn now to a brief summary of the content. The whole treatise, whether it had its origin in a dream or not, seems to have been inspired by the following passage in Maimonides, "Eight Chapters," c. 4. There, commenting on the verse *והאמת והשלום אהבו* (Zech. 8, 19), Maimonides continues: *ודע שהאמת הם המעלות השכליות מפני שהם אמתיות לא ישתנו . . . והשלום הם מעלות המדות שבהם יהיה השלום בעולם*. "Know that by 'truth' are meant the intellectual virtues, because they are immutable verities . . . ; 'peace' means the moral virtues through which peace is maintained on earth." He repeats the same in the Commentary on Abot, end of c. 1 (comp. below note 149). Palquera divided the treatise into two parts, each consisting of two chapters. His purpose is in the main to inculcate such conduct as will enable men to attain to both physical well-being and intellectual or spiritual perfection, the reward of which is eternal happiness and bliss in the world to come. In a short introduction he very appropriately opens the discussion by quoting from the Psalms and Proverbs a few verses which, interpreted in the light of his philosophy, allude to the subject of his treatise.

CHAPTER I. ON PHYSICAL WELL-BEING (*שלום הגוף*). The human body is comparable to a vessel about to set out for a voyage on the ocean; the soul to the captain who is

to guide its course and to control its movements and who is responsible for its safe arrival in the destined port—the world to come.¹² To insure a safe voyage through a long life there is need of strict observance of hygienic rules, abstinence from over-indulgence in eating and drinking and sexual intercourse. The chapter closes with a quotation from one of the works of the famous Jewish physician Isaac b. Solomon Israeli (died about 950) prescribing a proper diet.¹³

CHAPTER II. ON THE WELL-BEING (OR THE PERFECTION) OF THE SOUL (שְׁלוֹם הַנֶּפֶשׁ). There are two degrees in the perfection of the soul. The first, or lower degree, consists in nobility of character, the second, or higher, degree is the achievement of the highest possible intellectuality.¹⁴ Palquera discusses here moral perfection only,

¹² See above note 10.

¹³ See below notes 57-67.

¹⁴ This distinction in human perfections is based on Maimonides' exposition on the subject in his *Guide*, II, 27; III, 54, which in turn is a modification of an Aristotelian theory. Aristotle, *Ethics*, I, 8 f., counts three kinds of perfection, two of which, wealth, being external (ἐκτός), and health, concern only the body, while the third, consisting in intellectual achievements, concerns the soul. Maimonides goes one step farther, subdividing the perfection of the soul into two distinct parts, the one representing the consummation of the moral qualities (ethico-religious aspect), the other the highest degree of intellectuality (metaphysical aspect). According to this doctrine of Maimonides, moral perfection is not an end in itself, but serves to make man capable of attaining intellectual perfection which is the final aim of human life. This theory is taken up here by Palquera. Having discussed in the preceding chapter those means which assure bodily perfection, he now turns to the discussion of the perfection of the soul. Like Maimonides, he, too, considers morality as the first or preliminary step on the road to real perfection, i. e. intellectuality. This theory, among others, has often brought severe attacks on Maimonides and his followers whose words have been falsely interpreted to mean that by reaching intellectual perfection one can dispense with all ethics and religion, or as Luzzatto in his biased antagonism to Maimonides puts it, "one can commit theft, murder, and adultery, and yet be sure of inheriting the world to come, provided he be a philosopher" (*Kerem Chemed*, III, 69.

leaving the discussion of intellectual perfection to the second part.¹⁵ The elements that make up the human character, he says, are partly innate, partly acquired by training and education. All good and bad animal instincts are to be found also among men. Just as some animals are amenable to training and domestication, while others always remain wild and vicious, so some men respond readily to reason and persuasion, while others are proof against any influence through education. The natural inclinations of man, which constitute his character, are not the product of the cognitive soul or the intellect; they are blind animal impulses in man.¹⁶ Palquera quotes here opposing views, but denies their validity. The human soul is divided into three parts or functions: the *appetitive* or lowest soul (הנפש המתאווה = ἐπιθυμητικόν), the *spirited or intermediate* soul (הנפש הכעסנית = θυμικόν), and the *cognitive* or the highest soul (הנפש המדברת = λογιστικόν), a theory taken from Plato.¹⁷ The appetitive soul is necessary in order to insure life and the perpetuation of the

bottom). It is needless to defend Maimonides against attacks like these. Such an idea never entered the mind of Maimonides or of any of his followers, nor can it be taken as a logical consequence of Maimonides' doctrine as set forth in the chapters criticised. For Maimonides, as well as for his disciples, and among them the author of the present treatise, it is impossible to attain intellectual perfection, that is a true comprehension of God and the universe, without at the same time being a strict observer of all the laws of God as commanded in the Torah. Luzzatto's conclusions have, indeed, been fully refuted by N. Krochmal, *Kerem Chemed*, IV, 265; comp. also Senior Sachs, *היונה*, 67 f. The question whether intellectuality ('ilm) or practical observance of the religious law ('amal) is of higher importance was an object of much controversy also among Arabic writers, on which see the masterly presentation by Prof. Goldziher in the notes on his edition of Pseudo-Bahya's *Kitāb ma'ānī al-naḥs*, Berlin 1907, 54-60, particularly, with reference to Maimonides, p. 58.

¹⁵ Comp. Aristotle's *Ethics*, VI, 2, beginning.

¹⁶ See above note 10.

¹⁷ See above note 10.

race. To keep it from excesses, the cognitive soul must have recourse to the services of the intermediate or spirited soul, the source of power and courage. Its services are like those of the dog that assists the hunter in pursuing the game.¹⁸ It is the task of the cognitive soul to control the functions of the two lower souls lest they deviate from the *media via*, the golden mean; for a perfect character is attainable only through maintaining an equilibrium among these lower functions.¹⁹

Palquera proceeds to point out some of the traits in human nature that go to make up a good character, such as modesty, self-control, and abstemiousness. Whoever possesses these qualities will benefit by instruction and education, and is on the road to intellectual perfection. He, however, that is wanting in character, can never attain to the highest degree of intellectual perfection. It is possible to correct faults of the intellect by proving to any one that his ideas are wrong, but extremely hard to turn a bad character into a good one. To break bad habits requires constant introspection and self-restraint. Man's love for himself is boundless; living up to the rule of *γνώθι σεαυτόν* is, therefore, an extremely difficult art.²⁰ Men are properly divided into three distinct classes, according as they are governed by one or the other of the phases of the tripartite soul. The majority of men fall a prey to the passions that come from the lowest or appetitive soul. Their sole aim in life is the gratification

¹⁸ The same comparison is used by Gazzali, מאמרי צדק, 67, bottom; Joseph Ibn Aknin, ספר מוסר, edited by Bacher, Berlin 1910, p. 108; comp. *ib.*, 176, and below, note 75.

¹⁹ See my article on Palquera, *JQR.*, 1910, p. 160, n. 15.

²⁰ This sentence will be discussed in a special article, see note 10.

of their sensual desires. Others are dominated by the intermediate or spirited soul, and this manifests itself in a morbid ambition for honors and power. A minority follow the better impulses of the highest, or cognitive soul, and modestly pursue knowledge and wisdom.²¹ However, the three impulses are necessary for the perpetuation of mankind. It is man's duty to control through his intellect the two lower forces and to keep to the middle course. Palquera gives a few rules on the manner of observing the golden mean. In conclusion, he asserts that all good qualities of character are clearly indicated in Scripture, especially in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

PART II. CHAPTER I. ON TRUTH. Palquera draws a line between *moral* truth, or truthfulness in speech and action (אמת התלויה בדבר שפתים), and *speculative*, or intellectual, truth (אמת התלויה בציור), the realization of the true conception of things. This chapter is devoted to the moral aspect of truth. He has little to say on the subject, because truthfulness, as one of the moral qualities constituting character, has been discussed in the preceding chapter. Here he gives little more than a collection of Scriptural verses, Talmudic passages, dicta of Aristotle and others on truth. He quotes from Aristotle, to whom he refers also as הפילוסוף הידוע ליונים 'the famous Greek philosopher': "Uprightness is the noblest of all moral qualities, outshining even the splendor of the morning and the evening stars."²²

Some people, divinely inspired, are capable of sacrificing their very lives for truth. These are exemplified in the patriarchs and the prophets. Solomon puts the proc-

²¹ See below, note 87.

²² See below, note 95.

lamation of truth into the mouth of God's "Hokmah" (Prov. 8, 1-8). Love for truth is man's real life; those who have no regard for truth can hardly be considered real men. Therefore, the Talmud calls the wicked dead (Berakot 18b). Lying is the root of all evils, while righteousness and honesty are the life-spring of all existence. Lying leads to hypocrisy. Said 'the famous Greek philosopher': "The liar is preferable to the hypocrite; for the former sins only in speech, the latter also in his actions; worse than both is the arrogant."²³

CHAPTER II. ON SPECULATIVE (OR INTELLECTUAL) TRUTH. The highest truth in an intellectual sense is to be compared to the *summum bonum* in the ethical sense.²⁴ Just as all men aspire to reach the absolute good, so all thinkers seek to attain the absolute truth; while but few succeed. For the acquisition of perfect truth, as is hinted at by David (Ps. 25, 5), is possible only through divine assistance. Two ways lead to the cognition of truth. The first and surest way is through the study of the Torah and the ideas involved in it, such as the existence and unity of God, *creatio ex nihilo*, God's Providence over *individuals* among men and over the *species* among other creatures,²⁵ reward and punishment, and other noble teachings expressed or hinted at in the Bible and elaborated in the teachings of the rabbis. Any one who penetrates into the true meaning of the words of the Scriptures will find therein divine secrets and truth which transcend the comprehen-

²³ See below, note 114.

²⁴ See the references in note 117.

²⁵ Following Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 17, 18; see Munk *ad locum*, 131, n. 1.

sion of the philosophers. Various verses are quoted in support of this assertion.

The second way of acquiring truth, which is only an auxiliary method, is through the study of those doctrines of the philosophers which contain axiomatic truths or "first principles" (מושכלות ראשונות = *ἀρχαί*). The truth contained in these principles proceeds, according to some, from the senses, while, according to others, it emanates from God, the source of all knowledge. The latter view, according to some, is indicated in the fourth of the Eighteen Benedictions: "Thou grantest man wisdom" (אתה חונן לאדם דעת).²⁶ Whatever is consonant with these principles and does not contradict any of the statements of the Torah or of tradition is acceptable truth.

On the basis of a passage of the Talmud (*Erubin* 53a), Palquera asserts that our ancestors, living on holy soil and being so near in time to the prophets and the other holy men from whom they received traditional truth direct, were not obliged to resort to the study of the works of the philosophers. We, however, in the diaspora, with minds dulled by oppression and persecution, find it necessary to study the works of the genuine philosophers and to learn their methods of demonstration in order to support thereby what we know already by tradition.²⁷ Therefore the rabbis say, When a man dies, he is asked whether he has studied philosophy (פלפלת בחכמה, *Shabb.* 31a). Wherever the views of the philosophers contradict the Torah or tradition

²⁶ This matter will be taken up for detailed discussion, see above, note 10.

²⁷ Comp. Saadya, *אמונות ודעות*, Leipzig 1864, 11: אנחנו חוקרים ומעיינים בעניני תורתנו בשני ענינים האחד מהם שיתברר אצלנו בפעל מה שידענו מנביאי ועל הדרך הזה ... נעיון ונחקור להוציא אל [הפעל] מה; האלהים במדע; and *ib.*, 12: מה שיהודיענו אלהינו במדע; see also Maimonides, *Guide*, I, 71.

they should be rejected, otherwise they are to be accepted. This has been the practice of all the pious men in Israel since the close of the Talmud, *some* of the Geonim, and *many* of the Spanish scholars, especially Maimonides; they refuted the doctrines antagonistic to the Torah and spread true knowledge broadcast.

Palquera then enumerates the various branches of science—namely, mathematics, logic, physics, and metaphysics—and recommends them for study in the order given. He quotes, however, the opinion of Maimonides, who requires the study of logic before mathematics (*Guide*, I, 34). Of the works written on these sciences, those of Aristotle, including with them also the works of his commentators, are the best and the most reliable. This is because Aristotle examined the views of all his predecessors and accepted only what is true or nearest to the truth. However, a passage from Maimonides in which the latter has placed the Stagirite only one degree below the prophets, provokes Palquera's opposition. "In my humble opinion," he says, "the master has exaggerated on this point."²⁸ The truth is, Palquera continues, that in our days, any one who wishes to add some secular knowledge to the knowledge he has acquired through the study of the Torah must try to understand Aristotle. He should, however, never lose sight of the Torah, for it comes before philosophy (Abot, 3, 11).

In a somewhat lengthy discussion that follows, Palquera tries to show that the final aim of all thinking is the cognition of Him who is the source of all truth and the cause of all existence. In fact, some philosophers assert that, in truth, God alone has existence or reality.

²⁸ See below, note 141.

Again, 'the famous Greek philosopher' is quoted to the effect that metaphysics ought to be named the science of truth because its aim is to reach God, the highest truth. It is obvious, Palquera adds, that since God is the cause of truth, we cannot attain truth if we do not know God, for the effects are known only through their causes.²⁹

In a short concluding paragraph, ending with the quotation of a Midrash, Palquera now gives the sum and substance of his thesis. The comprehension of truth must be the ultimate aim of human endeavor. The prerequisites to science in the quest of truth are righteousness, or the life of perfect harmony attained through adherence to the golden mean; mercy, or the conduct that goes beyond the strict requirement of justice; and loving-kindness and charity, the source of peace on earth through which the world exists,³⁰ as the Psalmist says (Ps. 85, 11-12):

"Mercy and truth are met together,
Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.
Truth springeth out of the earth,
And righteousness looketh down from heaven."

As interpreted by Palquera, the Psalmist's words, "mercy, righteousness, and peace" stand for the moral qualities; "peace" evidently in the sense of harmony, as used in Greek philosophy, being their final aim, while "truth" represents the highest perfection of the intellect. When character and intellect work in unison, then salvation will be at hand and God's glory will dwell in the land (*ib.*, verse 10).

The above is a brief résumé of the leading thoughts in the present treatise. For details concerning the text and

²⁹ See above note 10.

³⁰ Contains an allusion to chapters 1-2. The whole is a philosophic reproduction of Mishnah Abot c. 1, end; see above p. 458.

the relation of the work to other works and other authors the reader is referred to the notes. It is a habit of Palquera's, observable in all his productions, to intersperse his discourses with numerous quotations, without specifying the authors. As he himself remarks in one of his works,³¹ he quotes only men of the highest rank by their names; minor lights are quoted by some general epithet. In no case are the books of the authors mentioned from which the quotation was taken. It has therefore been no easy task to identify and trace these quotations to their respective sources. Some I have had to content myself with tracing to one or the other of his own works without going back to the original source. A few I could not identify, because the Arabic works from which they are probably taken are not at my disposal. It goes without saying that in Palquera's text biblical verses, talmudic and midrashic passages, or general allusions to Midrash and Talmud are given without references. The proper references are added in the notes.

The celebrities quoted in this treatise by name are Plato, Aristotle, Galen, Isaac Israeli, and Maimonides. Aristotle is also referred to three times (pp. 486, 488, 493) under the epithet "the famous Greek philosopher." Hipprocrates is meant by the phrase ראש הרופאים (p. 474), "the greatest of the physicians" (see below note 58).

A few words about the manuscript may be added here to what was said above (p. 453). It is the sixth number in a codex, paper, 5 by 1½ inches, containing thirteen different pieces by various authors. It is written in Italian rabbinical characters, dating from various centuries. Our treatise

³¹ ספר המעלות, or "Book of the Degrees," Berlin 1894, p. 12; comp. *JQR.*, 1910, p. 173, n. 42.

begins on leaf 63*a* and ends 83*b*. Unfortunately part of the manuscript is missing between 63*b* and 64*a*, a fact that escaped the notice of Luzzatto, who described the codex (see above, p. 454) and also of Margoliouth. In all probability, however, it is only one leaf that is missing, and it belonged to the introduction. The gap is indicated in the following edition by a blank line.

The copyist, it appears, had a rather limited knowledge of Hebrew. A considerable number of mistakes are due to his ignorance. These will be pointed out in the notes on the respective passages.

The treatise is followed by an extract from the ספר היסודות ("Book on the Elements") by Isaac Israeli (see above p. 459), which was published by S. Fried, Drohobycz 1900. The extract, in Fried's edition, p. 12, line 1, to p. 13, line 13, does not fit into the plan of our treatise. Some doubts may be entertained as to whether it was appended to this treatise by Palquera himself, for immediately after this extract there are two other short discourses,³² both anonymous, which, owing to their style and content, can not possibly be ascribed to Palquera. Luzzatto,³³ however, evidently considered it a part of Palquera's work, and, as I think, rightly so. There is a lengthy passage from one of Israeli's works embodied in this treatise (see text, p. 476). This makes it probable that the extract, too, was added by Palquera. There is, moreover, some internal evidence for this assumption. Israeli's work, the Arabic original of which is lost, was translated into Hebrew before the year 1230 by Abraham Ibn H̥isdai of Barcelona. A comparison

³² Both are written in the style of the later Midrashim and may be extracts from such.

³³ *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, VI, 19.

of this translation with the extract at the end of Palquera's treatise makes it evident that the latter is not taken from Ibn Hisdai's translation, but is an independent translation from the Arabic of Israeli, in all probability from the hand of Palquera. The extract under consideration contains three proofs for the theory that the soul is not merely an accident of the body perishing with it, but a substance with an independent and imperishable existence. Palquera, as it will be remembered, had also discussed the nature and functions of the human soul. He may not have found a convenient place in his text for Israeli's views, which are also his own, and therefore left them for an appendix.

The two translations of Israeli's text correct and explain one another at several points, as is shown in the notes. The extract being of importance for the history of Jewish writings on philosophy, it is worthy of publication in the form given to it by Palquera, as an appendix to his ethical treatise.

In submitting this text of Palquera's treatise, it is hoped that it will prove a welcome contribution to the ethical literature of the Jews. In conclusion, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Prof. Israel Friedlaender, who, while in London, secured for me the photograph of the manuscript, and to the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, in whose possession the photograph now is, which generously defrayed the expense of obtaining it for my studies.

[63a] אגרת שחברה ה"ר שם טוב פלקירה ז"ל.

אגרת אוגרת דברי שלום ואמת חברה ה"ר שם טוב פלקירה
ז"ל ואמר שראה בחלום שהיה מחבר זאת האגרת ובהקיץ נתעסק
בה וזאת התחלתה:

5 מי האיש החפץ חיים ארוכים אוהב ימים לראות טוב (34)
ענינו מי האיש החפץ חיים ארוכים אוהב ימים ארוכים לראות טוב
ואפשר לומר כי ר"ל באמרו חיים החיים הארוכים שאין להם
סוף והם חיי העולם הבא וטוב הטוב הצפון לצדיקים לעתיד
לבוא כאמרו (35) מה רב טובך אשר צפנת ליראיך. נצור לשונך
10 מרע ושפתיך מדבר מרמה (36) ענינו [63b] מלבד [מדבר ר. רע
והם הדברים המזיקים לבני אדם והמרמה דברי החנופה שמרמה
בהם האדם לחברו כי זה גורם היוזק למדבר ולמי שידובר בו (37)
ואמר שלמה (38) נצר פיו שמר נפשו פשק שפתיו מחתה לו והזהיר
האדם שישמר מכל הדבורים שמסכבים היוזק על מדברם. ויפה
15 אמר האומר (39) כי אין דבר מורה יותר על לב האדם ולא יותר
ממית אותו וממהר להרגו מלשונו והודאת פיו כמאה עדים. ועל

34) Ps. 34, 13.

35) *Ib.* 31, 20; comp. Talmud *Hullin* 142.

36) *Ib.* 34, 14.

37) Comp. Talmud 'Arakin 15b and Maimonides, Commentary on Abot I, 16.

38) Prov. 13, 3.

39) The passage seems to be a direct quotation from some author; possibly however, it is only an allusion to 'Arakin 15b, Palquera giving the thought of the Talmud in his own words, as he does with the Midrash quoted below, note 41. In Palquera's מבקש, 19b, the same passage occurs without reference to any source. The sentence הודאת פיו כמאה עדים is a play on a legal rule in Baba Mez. 3b.

כן צריך שישמר בשנים [משני 1.] דברים ממיתים ומשנים
מזיקים. והממיתים כמדבר דברים כנגד הדת או כנגד המלך
או בעל ממשלה כי צריך להזהר שלא לדבר דבר שהוא כנגד
הדת בין נגלה בין נסתר (40)

5 [64a] שאין לו הפך. ומה נכבד דבר האומר (41) כי הטעם שלא
נאמר בשני כי טוב מפני מחלוקת שקרה בנבראים כלומר
ההבדלה וזה דבר אמת כי לולא המחלוקת היו כל הנבראים
נצחיים. ומפני שיש דברים שהם סבת שלום הנפש והשארה על
שלמותה חלקתי השער הראשון לשני שערים הראשון בשלום
הגוף והשני בשלום הנפש. 10

השער הראשון בשלום הגוף. צדק משל הקדמונים (42)
הממשיל גוף האדם לספינה והנפש לרב החובל כמו שתכלית
הספינה לעבור בים ללכת אל מקום חפצו כן תכלית הגוף להיות
מרכב (?) (43) לנפש ומעבר ללכת אל עולמה. על כן אשרי הנפש
15 [64b] נמלטה בעברה ולא טבעה ביון התאוה ויפה אמרו ז"ל
תנה לו כמו שנתנה לך (44) ויש חטאים [חוטאים 1.] בנפשותם
על עמלם ויגיעם בתקון גופם ואין להם עסק בתקון הנפש
האנושית והנה הם כאדם שמישים כל השתדלותו בתקון סוסו (45)
שיהיה בריא וחזק ויפה ומתרשל בתקון נפשו ואינו מתבייש
20 מחליו ומכעורו אבל המשכיל ישתדל בתקון גופו מפני תקון
נפשו. ודבר ידוע כי המדות הרעות כרבו תאות המאכל

40) Here the manuscript is defective, see above p. 468; the content can be supplied, however, at least in part, from the מבקש, l. c.

41) Refers to Midrash Ber. Rab. IV, 6: טוב. למה אין כתיב בשני כי טוב. ר' חנינא אומר שבו נבראה מחלוקת שנאמר ויהי מבדיל בין מים למים comp. above note 39; Abr. Sab'a, צרור המור, Venice 1523, fol. 1, col. b.

42) See above, note 10.

43) The reading is doubtful, but מרכב is the nearest emendation (comp. Gazzāli, מאוני צדק, 134: הנפש הוא מרכבת הנפש) and is the proper parallel to מעבר.

44) Babli Shabb. 152b.

45) Comp. below, note 59.

וקבוצ הממוז ביותר ונבהל להון והוא איש רע עין והקנאה
 סבה להיוזק הנפש ובלבד דבר שפתים שהוא ברוב לפוקה
 ולמכשול לגוף האדם ולנפשו כמו שנוכר למעלה. ואומר
 כי שלום [65a] הגוף יגיע לאדם בהיות כחותיו על
 מתכונת השלמות כל אחד עומד על משמרתו לשמור הגוף 5
 מהמזיקים אותו עד הקץ הקצוץ לו וזה יתכן בהשמר האדם
 מהדברים המפסידים אותו המטים אותו מהאמצעות (46) או אל
 הרבוי או אל החסרון כרבוי המשגל ואכילת המאכלים הרעים
 והרבוי ממאכל הטוב. ובמצות רבות צונו להמנע מזה כאסור
 העריות והזנות והיות לאדם עתות קצובות לזה הפעל כי רבוי 10
 מפסיד הגוף ומזיק לנפש ויפה אמרו ז"ל אבר קטן יש באדם
 משביעו רעב מרעיבו שבע (47) ועל דרך השלמות (48) לא היה אדם
 ראוי להשתמש בו אלא לאחד משני דברים או לקיים המין או
 להקל משכבת הזרע כי רבוי במקצת בני [65b] אדם מביא
 לידי חלי בהכבירו על הטבע אף ע"פ שיש אומר שאין צורך 15
 להוציא על דרך שמירת הבריאות ומפורסם הוא בינינו כי הפורש
 מזה הפעל לגמרי נקרא קדוש והעד אלישע ע"ה כמו שבארנו
 [שבארו r.] חכמינו ז"ל (49) והמחשבה בו וההרהור מחזק אותו ועל
 כן אמרו ז"ל ונשמרת מכל דבר רע שלא יהרהר אדם ביום ויבוא

46) See *JQR.*, 1910, p. 160, n. 25.

47) *Babli Sanhedrin* 107a; comp. *Yerushalmi Ketub.* V, 8; Palquera's
ראשית חכמה, 14 f.; Gazzālī, *l. c.*, 201.

48) The author alludes here to the Aristotelian doctrine that the sense
 of touch is the lowest of all senses; see below, note 79.

49) This has reference to a passage occurring only in *Yerush. Yebam.*
 II, 4 and *Wayyikra Rab.*, XXIV, 6: הכתוב אמר ר' יהודה בן פזי ולמה סמך הכתוב:
 פרשת עריות לפרשת קדושין ללמדך שכל מי שהוא פורש מן העריות נקרא קדוש
 שכן שונמית אומרת לאישה הנה נא ידעתי כי איש אלהים קדוש הוא.
 Palquera misinterprets the passage taking it to enjoin celibacy, while in
 fact it is only a general exhortation to holiness and chastity in sexual
 intercourse. Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 8, refers to the same passage, but
 does not use it as an argument for celibacy; comp. Munk, *ad locum*. Stein-
 schneider's suggestion that Palquera remained single (see my article in
JQR., 1910, p. 157) gains hereby much in probability.

לידי טומאה בלילה (50) ואמרו (51) כי זהו ענין ונפשי לא מטמאה
 (היא) וידוע כי המחשבה בעניני התורה והחכמה תמעט
 מההרהור או תמנע אותו לגמרי וכן אמרו ז"ל (52) בני אם פגע
 בך מנוול זה משכהו לבית המדרש אם אבן הוא נמוח אם ברזל
 הוא מתפוצץ שנאמר (53) הלא כה דברי כאש נאם ד' וכפטיש
 יפצץ סלע. והחכם [66a] אמר (54) אל תטה אל המשגל כי
 הוא מסגולת החזירים והם בו יותר חזקים ממך. ואומר כי
 דבר מפורסם הוא כי כל המאכלים הרעים שנולדות מהם הלחות
 הרעות (55) נאסרו לנו גם רבוי המאכל המותר והמשתה נאסר
 לנו והעד על זה בן סורר ומורה (56). ובשלום הגוף נכללים כל
 העונשים כי שלות [שלותו r.] בהשמר האדם שלא לעשות
 אותם הדברים שיש עליהם עונש הגוף כמו שהפסדו בעשיתם
 וזה דבר מבואר אין צורך להאריך בו. ובזה הענין נכלל ידיעת
 הנהגת הבריאות כי היא הכרחית למי שירצה שיעמוד גופו על
 מתכנתו שהוא כלי לנפש כי אז [66b] תעשה היא מעשה (sic)
 כראוי.

ואני זוכר בכאן בקצרה כללים מהנהגת הבריאות (57). אמר

50) Aboda Zarah 20b; Maimonides, l. c.

51) Ḥullin 37b. The verse from Ez. 4, 14 is not quoted correctly.

52) Sukkah 52b. Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 49 (Munk, p. 415), gives the same exposition of the passage.

53) Jerem. 23, 29.

54) Comp. ראשית חכמה, 15 and the references given below, note 87.

55) Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 48.

56) *Ib.*, III, 33 (Munk, 262, n. 2).

57) Most of the following rules are taken from Maimonides' famous Epistle on Hygienics, addressed to Al-Malik Al-'Afdal, son of Sultan Saladin. This treatise was translated into Hebrew by Moses Ibn Tibbon, a contemporary of Palquera, in 1244, and first published in *Kerem Chemed*, III, 9-31. In his enumeration of Maimonides' medical works Ibn 'Abi 'Uṣaibi'a quotes it under the title *في تدبير الصحة* (*Regimen sanitatis* = *Hygienics*). Some of the manuscripts of the Hebrew translation bear the corresponding title: ספר (מאמר ב) הנהגת הבריאות. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 770, and later in *Arabische Literatur der Juden*, 214, however, doubts whether this title of Ibn 'Abi 'Uṣaibi'a is the original one. From

ראש הרופאים 58) כי התמדת הבריאות תהיה להשמר מהמלוי
 מהמאכל ובעזיבת עצלת התנועה והנה כלל בדברו זה עקר שמירת
 הבריאות. ומה טוב מה שאמר הרמב"ם 59) אלו הנהיג האדם
 נפשו כמו שמנהיג סוסו שהוא רוכב אותו היה נמלט מחלאים
 רבים והוא כי לא תמצא אחד מבני אדם שיתן לבהמתו המספוא
 בלא אומ [אומד r.] אלא ישער אותו לה כפי מה שתסבול והוא
 אוכל בלא אומד מאין שעור והוא יבקר ענין תנועות בהמתו
 ומיגע אותה כדי שלא תעמוד ותמות ולא יפעל זה בנפשו. עד
 כאן. וידוע כי המלוי בכל ענין ממית יהיה ממאכל או משקה
 10 [67a] כי כמה מבני אדם מלא כרסו ונחנקו [ונחנק r.] ומת
 וגם אני ראיתי מהם. וצדק האומר כי יש אכילה מונעת אכילות
 60). והמלוי ברוב בני אדם סבת רוב החלאים ואין צריך שיאכל
 בעוד שלא יתאוה אליו כיהכנסת מזון על מזון שלא נתעכל מזיק
 מאוד וימנע מהאכילה בעוד שיש בנפש מקצת מהתאוה כי זאת

the passage before us it would appear that the Arabic original used by Palquera (comp. below, notes 58 and 59) bore the same title; for the words *מהנהגת הבריאות* are not to be taken simply as a general expression for hygienics—we would then expect *בהנהגת*, as is on p. 476, l. 14—, but rather as a direct quotation of Maimonides' work. Other parallels to the following passages are found in Maimonides' *הלכות דעות*, 3-5, and *מאמר היחוד*, pp. 36-38.

58) Refers to Hippocrates; comp. above p. 467; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, p. 658, n. 35. The passage is quoted from Maimonides' Epistle (p. 10), mentioned in the foregoing note, but not from the Hebrew translation of Moses Ibn Tibbon, which is entirely different, running as follows: *מאמר אפוקרט התמדת הבריאות בהשמר מן השבע והניח השברון מן היגיעה*; comp. *ib.*, p. 11: *התמדת הבריאות בהניח השברון מן היגיעה*; see next note.

59) In Moses Ibn Tibbon's translation the passage reads: *לוי הנהיג האדם עצמו כמו שיונהיג בהמתו אשר ירכוב עליה יהיה נצל מחלאים רעים וזה כי אתה לא תמצא אחד מבני אדם יתן מספוא לבהמתו יותר מדאי אלא ישערהו עליה לפי מה שתוכל לסבול והוא יאכל יותר מדאי מבלי שעור ומחשבה ויחשוב עניני תנועת בהמתו ויניעה כדי שלא תעמוד ותחלה ולא יעשה זה בגופו*; comp. Gazzali, *Ethics*, 134, 136. The lines over the words show the chief differences in the translations.

60) Judah Ibn Tibbon in his Testament (יהודה אבן תבון)

התאווה תבטל לאחר שעה ושעור המאכל כבריא [הבריא י.].
השעור אשר כשיאכלהו לא יכבד על האסטומכה (*sic*) ולא יאכל
מאכל דק קל להתעכל על מאכל גם קשה להתעכל (*sic*) ויש
מבני אדם שיפסד בבטנו המאכל הדק ויתעכל (*sic*) בו הגם
5 וזה הוא מי שהאסטומכה שלו חמה מאוד ומהם מי שהוא בהפך
[67b] וכל אחד יצווה כפי מה שיחייב מנהגו. ולמקומות
סגולות מהטבע והמנהגים ולא יוכל האדם לדעת אותם בסברא
כי יש מזון מורגל יש בו היזק והוא יותר מועיל מהטוב שאינו
מורגל. וכל מזג מזון נאות ויש מבני אדם מי שיוזקוהו מקצת
10 מהמזונים הטובים על כן ינסה הפקח ממה שיועיל לו מה שלא
יוכל לדעתו זולתו מצד סברא ואעפ"כ מי שיתעכלו בבטנו
המזונים הרעים לא יפותה בזה כי באורך ימים יולדו בגופו
לחות רעות מחליאות וממיתות (61). ואומר כי המזונים המשונים
מזיקין מצד שניים בעכול והתערב המעוכל עם מה שאינו מעוכל
15 ומצד מה שיאכל [68a] מהם יותר ממה שיאכל מחמין האחר
ובתורתנו נאמר (62) בין הערבים תאכלו בשר ובבקר תשבעו לחם וזהו
המנהג הטוב מפני שנת הלילה כי אז יתעכל יותר. ויש מהרופאים
שצוו שיאכל שליש המאכל בבקר ובערב שני שלישים. ומהם
שאמרו שיאכל האדם בבקר הבשר ובערב לא יאכל אלא הלחם

והרחק edited by Steinschneider, Berlin 1852), p. 10, admonishes his son: *והרחק*
This may be the source of Palquera who changed the sentence slightly to fit the text. He quotes
of Palquera who changed the sentence slightly to fit the text. He quotes
the same in מבקש, 6a, introducing it by ואמר החכם, and adds to it the
following epigram:

יקולל מאכל אחד אשר הוא
ישנה גוף אנוש הרב שממה
ויש מאכל יביאו איש במעיו
ויוציא מגויה הנשמה.

The same rather common-place thought is expressed in the rime quoted
by Judah Ibn Tibbon (*ib.*, p. 11) in the name of Samuel Hanagid.

61) Comp. Maimonides' Epistle, p. 30.

62) Ex. 16, 12.

לברו וצוו שלא יאכל חלב עם המזון החמוץ (63) ולא דג עם חלב כי יולידו חלאים רעים בצרעת [כצרעת. r.] יאמרו [ואמרו. r.] כי היזק הלחם כשלא יתעכל הוא יותר מהיזק הבשר כשלא יתעכל ודע זה. והיין היה נכון לשתותו על דרך הרפואה לא בכל עת כמו שנהגו בזמננו זה ואין ראוי לשתותו אלא 5 [68b] [אחר העכול (64) לא תכף האכילה (*sic*) כי הוא יוליד המזון בגוף ועדיין לא נתעכל ושתית היין על המזון הרע יזים מאוד בין קודם העכול בין לאחר העכול מפני שהוא מוליד לקצוות הגוף המזון הרע. וכמו כן אין ראוי לשתותו על הפרות 10 ובלבד האבטיחים ומי שהורגל לשתותו על המזון ימעט (*sic*) ממנו והבריא ישתה ממנו אחר ההקזה והוא מועיל למי שמוחו חזק ומי שמוחו חלש ימעט ממנו או ישתהו מזוג. ושתית הקטנים ליין כאש על אש (65).

והנני זוכר בכאן דבר מועיל מאוד בהנהגת האדם בבריאותו וחליו זכר אותו החסיד יצחק הישראלי (66). אמר זה הנהגה הדקה 15 כלומר אכילת המאכלים הממהרים להתעכל המולידים חלטים טובים הם [69a] שומרים הבריאות יותר מכל דבר למהירות עכולם ושהם נתכים במהרה מהאברים והדם הנולד מהם טוב וכמו כן זו ההנהגה מועילה מאוד ברפואת החליים ודוחה החלאים 20 שיש להם זמן רב כך שמעתי זולתם עד שפעמים רבים (*sic*)

63) Maimonides' Epistle, 30.

64) *Ib.*, p. 28; comp. מבקש, 15b.

65) Maimonides, *l. c.*, in the name of Galen: ...ולא יקרבו אליו הקטנים: כי הוא מזיק להם מאוד...כבר אמר גאלינוס כי אין ראוי שיקח הנער ממנו כלום כי אם אחר שלשה שבועות ר"ל אחד ועשרים שנה.

66) This passage is probably taken from Israeli's Arabic work on Diätetics parts of which exist also in Latin (Basle 1570) and in Hebrew translations (unpublished) which are not at my disposal; comp. Steinschneider, *Arab. Liter.*, p. 40, No. 3.—The text before us offers some difficulties due to incorrectness of copyists. The construction of the first sentence is not clear, nor do the words *כך שמעתי זולתם* give any satisfactory sense. *לחות* is used by Palquera also in his other works for *humores*; comp. e. g. הנפש, c. 2; מבקש, 14-16 and *passim*. *סיטום* is the Aramaic spelling for *סיתום* (מבקש, 13a, 15b) = "obstruction."

לא יצטרך החולה ברפואת חליו אל הסמים וזולתם. ועל כן היה
 הטוב ברוב החליים שישתדל הרופא להגיע אל התכלית שכונתו
 אליו מרפואת החליים בהנהגה הדקה בלבד ויזהר שלא יאכל
 הסמנים אלא לעתים רחוקות ובשעת ההכרח אליהם ושאי אפשר
 5 זולתם כי ההנהגה שהיה במאכלים הדקים יש בה תועלת פעמים
 רבות לפי [למי r.] שיש בגופו חלטים סנים [עבים r.]
 וגסים ולמי שיש סטום בכבדו [69b] וקושי בטחולו. ואמר גלינוס
 והנהגה הדקה פותחת סטומי הכבד ויתיר קושי הטחול הנקרא
 בערבי צלאבה וישיבהו אל ענינו הטבעי ואני ראיתי אנשים
 10 רבים שארעו להם חליים קשים ונתרפאו בהנהגתם בהנהגה הדקה
 ואחרים הקל מעליהם החלי עד כאן.

השטר השני בשלום הנפש. שלמות הנפש הראשון (67) הוא
 בשלימות מדותיה ויש מהמדות שהן טבעיות באדם כמו החכמות
 הטבעיות שהן המקודמות הראשונות ויש מהן נקנות בלמוד
 15 ובהרגל. וצדקו האומרים כי כל יצירות (68) ב"ח הטובות מהן
 והרעות נמצאות בבני אדם וכן נמצא הדבר כי כמו שיש מב"ח
 מקבל המוסר במהירות [70a] כמו הסוס ומהם מי שלא יקבל
 ואם יקבלוהו (69) בקושי גדול מאוד כמו הדוב ומהם מי שלא
 יקבלוהו בשום פנים האפעה והעקרב כן עניני בני אדם יש מהם
 20 מי שיקבל המוסר בקלות והוא המבין ועליו נאמר (70) תחת גערה
 במבין מהכות כסיל מאה כי הוא נוכח בדבור בלבד ומהם מי
 שיקבלוהו בקושי ובמכות והוא הפתי ועליו נאמר (71) שבט לנו
 חסר לב ומהם מי שלא יקבלוהו בשום פנים והטורח עמו לריק
 ועליו נאמר (72) אם תכתוש [את] האויל במכתש בתוך הריפות

67) See note 14.

68) Innate qualities or natural instincts; see above, note 10.

69) In the manuscript here follow the words **בשום פנים** with dots above the letters as a sign of cancellation. The copyist made the mistake through homoioteleuton, but noticed the omission before he proceeded and corrected it.

70) Prov., 17, 10.

71) *Ib.*, 10, 13.

72) *Ib.*, 27, 22; comp. מבקש, 18a, bottom; המעלות, 40; and Gazzālī, *Ethics*, 153.

בעלי לא תסור מעליו אולתו. וכמו שהגפן המדברית לא תעשה
 ענבים אופי [אפילו ר.] שיעבדה והעבודה לבטלה וגפן
 הכרמים תועיל בה העבודה ואם לא [70b] יעבדה או שלא
 תתן ענבים או שתתן מעט. והיצירה 73) ענין לנפש מצרכת לאדם
 שיפעל פעולות הנפש בלא הסתכלות ולא בחירה ודמיון זה כי יש
 מבני אדם כשישמעו פתאום הקול החזק יפחדו וכשיראו או
 ישמעו דבר משחק יצחקו בלי רצונם ולפעמים אפשר שלא ירצו
 לשחק ולא יוכלו. ועל כן יש אומרים כי היצירה אינה לנפש
 המדברת וראיתם מה שנראה מהיצירות בקטנים ובב"ח שאינם
 מדברים כמורך הלב בארנבת והגמל והגבורה בארי והתחבולה
 בשועל והקוף ועל כן אמר שלא יתערב בנפש המדברת דבר
 מהיצירות ושהם כלם פעולות הנפש שאינה מדברת. ומהם מי
 שאמר כי [71a] יתערב במדברת דבר מהיצירות אבל לא
 רובו. ויש אומרים כי כל היצירות למדברת בלבד עם שאר המקרים
 מהכעס והפחד והתשוקה והתענוג והיגון. והנראה מעיד על
 בטול דבריהם כי כשיסתכל האדם ימצא המדברת נבדלת
 מהמתאווה אין ביניהם דמות. והאלוה ית' השיג המתאווה באדם
 להכרח חיי הגוף והזרע 74) כי אלו בטלה תאות האדם למאכל
 לא ישאר חי ואלו לא היה לו תענוג גדול במשתמש (sic) לא
 היה משתמש בו. ומניעת המדברת למתאווה מרבוית התנוע
 [התנועה ר.] 75) לא היה אפשר לה אם לא היתה מסתייעת

73) See above, note 10.

74) Comp. Gazzāli, *Ethics*, 66, 120 ff.

75) The passage is somewhat obscure, but becomes clear through a parallel passage in Palquera's *המעלות*, ס', p. 46, where *מרבוי התנועה* is followed by *וצאת מהאמצעות*. The words *רבוי התנועה* accordingly denote the movement away from the *media via* in the direction of the two extremes. The point that Palquera wishes to bring out here is to show that the rational soul whose task it is to check the passions of the appetitive soul can do so only through the aid of the intermediate or spirited soul, a theory which is taken from Plato; comp. Edwin Wallace, *Aristotle's Psychology*, Cambridge 1882, XXXVII, top. The same thought is very frequently expressed by Gazzāli in his *Ethics*, pp. 61, 67, 93 *et passim*, where also the comparison with the dog is made; comp. above, note 18. The whole passage is also in *המעלות*,

בנפש הכעסנית ועל כן אמרו כי הקש הנפש הכעסנית אצל
 המדברת כהקש הכלב אצל הצייד כי כמו שהצייד [71b]
 כשלא יוכל לצוד הבהמה יסתייע בכלב כן (sic) כמו כן
 תסתייע המדברת בכעסנית כדי שתתחזק עמה על המתאווה
 5 (שבצמח 76). ואפשר שיתנועע הכלב בזולתי העת שיצטרך לו
 והגבלת שעות זו התנועה הוא לצייד כפי חדורו במלאכת הצייד
 ושיהיה הכלב לו משתעבד בקלות. ועל כן אמר אפלטון (77) כי השגת
 אמצעות כל אחד מחלקי הנפש אינו בטבע כל אדם אפשרי כי
 אם תהיינה השתים נפשות הבהמיות חזקות אינן משועבדות

46; comp. also *ib.*, 36, and Joseph Ibn Saddik, עולם קטן, ed. Horovitz, p. 37; Horovitz, *Die Psychologie bei den jüd. Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters*, III, 177, n. 91, where reference to Schmiedl, *Studien etc.*, Wien 1869, p. 145, is missing. So also Saadya, *Emunot*, Leipzig 1864, p. 145: (comp. Guttman, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Abraham Ibn Daud*, Goettingen 1879, p. 219, n. 1), and Abr. Ibn Ezra on Eccles. 7. 3: בעזרת על הנפש בעזרת הרוח צריכה הנשמה להתעסק בחכמה שתעזור אותה עד שתנצח הרוח. Somewhat similar is the view of Aristotle, *Ethics*, I, 13, p. 1102b, l. 29 ff.

76) The phrase המתאווה שבצמח is a combination of Platonic and Aristotelian terminology; see above, note 10.

77) In the ספר המעלות, p. 46, bottom, this quotation from Plato is fuller and runs as follows: ועל כן השגת [אמצעות] כל אחד מחלקי הנפש אינו בטבע כל אדם אפשרי כי אם תהיה * הנפש המדברת חסרת הדעת וקשה לשמוע וממהרת לאבד ואינה מתאווה לפעלים הטובים ותהיינה * (ותהיה) השתי נפשות הבהמיות חזקות אינם שומעות לקול הנפש המדברת אי אפשר שתשיג האמצעות. The words between the two asterisks seem to have been omitted in our treatise through homoioteleuton, as תהיינה may have been abbreviated into תהי. The phrase קשה לשמוע וממהרת לאבד, suggests Abot, V, 11. The whole passage seems rather of Aristotelian than of Platonic origin; comp. *Nicom. Ethics*, II, 9, p. 1109a ll. 24-26: διὸ καὶ ἔργον ἐστὶ σπουδαῖον εἶναι. ἐν ἐκάστῳ γὰρ τὸ μέσον λαβεῖν ἔργον, οἷον κίχλον τὸ μέσον οἷν παρὰ τὸς ἀλλὰ εἰδότης. Maimonides, "Eight Chapters," 4, quotes the same in the name of the philosophers: כבר אמרו כבר הוא ורחוק שימצא מי שהוא בטבע למעלות כלם ר"ל למעלות המדות ולמעלות השכליות מוזמן ומוכן; ודע שהעמידה על אמתת גבול האמצעי הוא קשה מאוד; comp. Gazzali, *Ethics*, 95; comp. Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, דרשות, Venice 1547, fol. 49d.

למדברת אי אפשר שישגי בעליהן מצוע המדות כי היושר יושג
בהתגבר המדברת על שתיהן.

והפילוסופים היו חוקרים טבעי הילדים ומי שהיה מהם עז
פנים ותאווה עצומה אלא שהיה [72a] מתבייש היתה להם
5 תוחלת בתקוננו כי הבשת מנפש פקחת רואה הדבר הנאה ותעמוד
אצלו ומי שאינו מתבייש נפשו עורת לא תראה הנאה ואין בה
טוב (78) וכמו שהנולד סומא מהקטנים או ראווה חלש לא יראה
יפיו [יופי ז.] הגוף או יראהו ראווה חלש כמו כן מי שהיתה
נפשו המדברת עורת בטבע לא יראה הנאה שהוא לנפש וכמו
10 שמצוה האברים יוליד הנאה בגוף כמו כן מצוה הנפש יוליד
יושר המדות. ואומר כי הרואה בעין השכל פחיתות תאוות החוש
הוא המרחיק אותו ויפה אמר האומר (79) כי חוש המשוש חרפה

78) On this discussion of the value of modesty comp. Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics*, I, 3, Arabic text, ed. Wise, New York 1901, p. 23, English translation, p. 63 f., and Gazzālī, *l. c.*, 107.

79) This has reference to Aristotle's *Ethics*, III, 13 p. 1118b, ff. 11, 2-4; *καὶ δόξειεν ἂν δίκαιως ἐπινεύδιστος εἶναι, ὅτι οὐχ ἡ ἀνθρώποι ἐσμὲν ὑπάρχει, ἀλλ' ἡ ζῶα*; comp. above, note 48. The idea that the sense of touch, on account of its function in the act of generation, is "a disgrace to humanity" was first introduced into Jewish literature by Maimonides, *Guide*, II, cc. 36, 40 (Munk, 285, n. 3; p. 312), III, cc. 8, 49 (Munk, pp. 53, 416), and has since become a canon with mediæval Jewish authors of all descriptions. Kaufmann in his work "*Die Sinne*," Leipzig 1884, p. 188 ff., gives a whole collection of passages from various authors who accepted this view and likewise quotes others who opposed it, among them Nahmanides. To this collection are to be added both Palquera and the anonymous author of the spurious *קובץ תשובות הרמב"ם* in *מגלת סתרים*, p. 43 (also in *אדרת אליהו*, Leipzig 1859, II, 35), as also the Karaites Elijah Bashyazi, Odessa 1871, fol. 196b, and Kaleb Afendopolo, see Steinschneider, *Cat. Leyden*, 131. Isaac Abrabanel, *משמיע ישועה*, Amsterdam 1644, fol. 9a, bottom, and Moses Ibn Ḥabib in his commentary on Bedaresi's *בחינת עולם*, Ferrara 1552, fol. 32a, may also be referred to. Comp. also Ibn Akinin, *ספר מוסר*, 76; Goldziher, *Kitāb*, 46; Steinschneider, *Polem. Literatur*, 304, where, however, the reference to the commentary of Shemtob Palquera on Maimonides' *Guide* seems to be a mistake for Shemtob b. Joseph b. Shemtob of the fifteenth century. Among the opponents is to be included the Kabbalist Abraham Sab'a of Lisbon, about 1500, who in his *צרור המור*, Venice 1523, fol. 8a, col. 2, top, attacks Aristotle in the following words: ואם לא נמצא

כי בו נשתתף עם הבחמות. ויש אומרים שהסבה שהיו כל בני
 אדם ואע"פ שבשתם מועט [72b] בשאר הדברים שמסתרים
 [מסתתרים. 1.] מבני אדם במשגל כח הנפש המלאכית שבהם
 כי אע"פ שאינו שלם בהם אותו הכח אעפ"כ נשאר בו מאותו
 הכח מה שתראה בו יופי המעלות וכעור התאוות ראות חלש 5
 ועל כן אם תוכל לראות זה ראות מבואר תשנא סוג התענוגים
 עד שיהיה האדם מתבייש מנפשו כל שכן שיתבייש מזולתו (80)
 ועל כן נאמר יהי בשתך מנפשך יותר מבשתך מזולתך. ומה טוב
 ומה נעים דבר החכם (81) אמר ומה שאבקש ממך שתחשוק אלה
 השנים פעלים והם שתבזה פעולות הנפש המתאוה והכעסנית 10

ביוני בליעל שמין מינות לא היה אומר חוש המשוש חרפה היא לנו כי דבר ה' בזה
 ואת מצותו הפר כי היא מצוה גדולה וקדושה מביאה את האדם לחיי העולם הבא.
 Of the same opinion is Meir Aldabi of Toledo (1360) in his *אמונה*,
 III, 5, beginning. The Jewish philosophers before Maimonides expressed a
 higher opinion of the sense of touch. Ibn Gabirol, for instance, *תקון*
מדות הנפש, Pressburg 1896, II, brings it into relation with the under-
 standing: *חוש המשוש אשר הוא ממין הבינה*; comp. Horovitz, *Psychologie*, p.
 140, n. 154, and Wise, *l. c.*, 33. In *המעלות*, pp. 68, 69, Palquera quotes
 Aristotle directly as saying: *הרגש המשוש אשר הוא חרפתנו הגדולה*;
 comp. also Gazzāli, *Ethics*, 139.

80) The same is found in the *Apophthegms* of Honein (מוסרי הפילוסופים),
 II, 19, No. 10, ed. Leventhal, p. 45: *מי שיתבייש מבני אדם ולא יתבייש*
מנפשו אין לנפשו ערך בעיניו. In Gazzāli's *Ethics*, 107, the sentence reads:
ומי שלא יבוש מנפשו ויבוש מאחרים באמת שנפשו היא יותר פחותה אצלו מזולתו.
 Gazzāli's sentence is found literally in Joh. Alemanno's *שער החשק*, Halber-
 stadt 1862, p. 21a; comp. also Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics*, Arabic text, p. 23: *וכא*

•יבגני לעאقل אנ יסחי מן الناس كذلك יבגני אנ יסחי מן نفسه.
 The Hebrew edition, Pressburg 1896, p. 30, has erroneously *להשכיל* for
להתבייש; comp. Baḥya, *Duties*, II, 5; S. Duran, Comm. on Abot III, 15,
 and *דרך ארץ זוטא*, c. 2.

81) I do not know to whom the author refers here in particular. In
המעלות, 36, nearly the same is quoted in the name of the "prominent
 ancient philosophers" (מהירי הפילוסופים הקדמונים); comp. chapter 10
 of Gazzāli's *Ethics*.

ומקריהם ואם תהיה כן אז יהיה הטוב הגון לך ואז תהיה נפשך בעליונה [73a]. שבמעלות הכבוד ואין מעלה ממעלות הכבוד יותר גדולה ועליונה ממעלת החולך בדרכי השם ית' ולא יהיה זה אלא בבזות התענוגים ומי שטבעו ישר ותרביתו טוב יקבל אלה הדברים אבל מי שטבעו הפך לא יקבלוהו [יקבלוהו. r.]. 5 והמוסר מקנה לנפש הכעסנית הרגל קלות השעבוד ויועיל לנפש הצומחת החולשת (*sic*). ומעת הילדות יהיו נראות באדם המדות שהוא נוטה אליהן כי הנוטה בילדותו אל תאות המאכלים ישאר כן כל ימיו וכן אם יאהב הכבוד והמשרה וכן אם יאהב החכמה וכן אמר המדבר ברוח הקדש 82) זרו רשעים מרחם תעו 10

82) Ps. 58, 4. The phrase מדבר ברוח הקדש is used by Palquera particularly (see below, pp. 489, 490) with reference to the Hagiographa, see his מורה המורה, 23, 63, 85, 112, 135; Samuel Ibn Tibbon, יקו המים, Pressburg 1837, pp. 22, 62, 68, 100, 174f. (comp. also 137); Levi ben Gerson, מלחמות ה', Leipzig 1866, p. 184; the Karaite Aaron ben Elijah, עין חיים, Leipzig 1844, p. 193, and גן עדן, Gozloff 1864, fol. 121d; Simon Duran, מגן אבות, II, 14a, bottom, III, 49b, 93a, top; Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, דרשות, Venice 1547, fol. 16c; Moses Ibn Habib, Commentary on בחינת עולם 4a, 16a; Isaac Abrabanel, ראש אמנה, cc. 14, 15. This usage, as far as I know, was first established by Maimonides, Guide, II, 45 ("Second Degree"; the Hebrew phrase is also in the Arabic original which proves that it was intended as a technical term), to signify a lower degree of divine inspiration than that attributed to the prophetic books; comp. Munk, *ad locum*, 334, n. 2; Profiat Duran, מעשה אפר, 13, top, especially Maimonides, הלכות תשובה, 12, 4, and the very interesting discussion on the subject by Abraham ben David and his opponent Shemtob ben Abraham Ibn Gaon in מגדל עוז, *ad locum*. Maimonides' view, adopted also by the Karaites Judah Hadassi (אשכל, Alphabet 53, letter ק' ; comp. *ib.*, 242, 'ש', 375, 'ה') and Aaron ben Elijah, עין חיים, 169, finds some support in the Talmud, where the order of succession is always תורה נביאים וכתובים; comp. e. g. Rosh hash. 32a (see *Tosafot, ib.*, s. v. (מתחיל), Baba Batra 13b. There is, however, no statement in the Talmud that the prophetic books rank higher than the Hagiographa as is the case with regard to the Pentateuch, Meg. 27a; comp. קרבן נתנאל on Asheri Meg., l. c., letter כ"א. The Gaonic tradition, quoted by Asheri on Rosh hash. 32b, that the Hagiographa have precedence before the Prophets, does not refer to the books in general but to the place of single verses from the respective books in certain liturgical pieces. In tractate Sopherim, XVIII, 3 (misquoted by Asheri, l. c., see קרבן נתנאל, *ad locum*) the Hagiographa are called דברי קדושה, and in the

מבטן דברי כזב כי מעת צאתם מהרחם הם זרים במדותיהם משאר
 הילודים ותועים [73^b] מבטן ובהחכם נאמר (83) בטרם אצרך
 בבטן ידעתוך ובטרם ואו' [וגומר ר.] כי אי אפשר שיקנה
 מעלות הנפש על השלמות אלא מי שטבעו ישר וכבר נאמר (84)
 5 כי המלמד לא יוכל להשים מי שטבעו רע שיהיה טבעו טוב.
 ואמרו כי אפשר ללמד הטוב למי שבו טוב אבל המוטבעים על
 הרע אם קרבת להם יפסידו אותך והרעות הנפסדות כשיגלה
 טעותם במופת או בבאור יסורו מהנפש אבל המדות הרעות
 ההוות מההרגל ומהטבע אפשר להחלישן אבל לבטלן לגמרי
 10 יצטרך להרגל תמיד ולדברים יפעלם האדם בכל יום. ותחלת
 מה שצריך אליו האדם שידרוש ויחקור ענין נפשו עד [74^a]
 שידעהו כי הוא מצטרך לזה בהכרח בידיעת המדות שצריך
 שירחיקן מנפשו או שיחסר מהם והמדות שצריך לחזקן. וידעת
 האדם לנפשו היא החכמה הגדולה (85) כי כל אחד מבני אדם
 15 לרבוי אהבתו לנפשו בטבע יטעה בענין נפשו ויראה אותה יותר
 נאה ממה שהיא וכן אמרו (86) כי נתלו בצאור [בצואר ר.] כל
 אחד ממנו שנים מרצופין [שני פרצופין ר.] האחת לפנינו והאחרת

קדושה Musaph Prayer for the New Year's festival, as also in the daily
 ובדברי קדשך the verses taken from the Hagiographa are always introduced by
 שיערי שמחה, Fürth 1891, comp. Isaac Ibn Gayyât (died 1039), כתוב ; לאמר
 Luzzatto, ור' האי אמר דמסורת היא דקרינן לכתובים כה"ק וכו' ; part I, p. 26:
 והכתובים הם הם שנקראו ביחוד כתבי הקדש יותר ; VIII, 7, *Kerem Chemed*,
 מהתורה והנביאים ועליהם אנו אומרים במוסף ראש השנה ובדברי קדשך כתוב
 comp. also Bacher, *Die Bibelexegese der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen*,
 p. 93, n. 4.

83) Jerem. i, 5.

84) This and the following sentences are quotations from Aristotle's
Ethics, II, 1, beginning; comp. VII, 8, p. 1151a, ll. 11-15. In המעלות
 69 f., Palquera quotes the same under the name of Aristotle; comp. מבקש,
 8a. The additional sentence, occurring there, comparing bad habits with
 paralysed-parts of the body (פלאג, see also *ib.*, 43, and Steinschneider,
Hebr. Übers., 843, n. 417) is also taken from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, I, 13,
 p. 1102b, ll. 18-21; comp. Gazzālī, *l. c.*, 76 f.

85) See above, note 10.

86) See above, notes 10, 20.

מאחרינו ועל כן לא נראה אותן כלל. ואמר החכם (87) כל אדם
 יתענג במה שהוא אהוב אצלו ותתענג הנפש השפלה הצומחת
 במאכלים והתענוגים. ואמר והבוחרים מאוד בתענוגים אין
 אני חושב שיש להם יתרון בשום דבר על החזירים. ותתענג
 הנפש התיכונה במחשבה והנצוח [74b] ותתענג הנפש העליונה 5
 בחכמות וידעת האמת ובני אדם נחלקים לאלה השלש כתות
 יש מהם כל כונתם בתאות החושים והם הרוב ומהם מי שכל
 כונתם להתפאר ולהתגבר ולנצח והם מעטים מהראשונים ומהם
 מי שכל כונתם ידיעת האמת והם מעט ויחיד בדור. ומאחר 10
 שאין דבר מאלה הכחות באדם לבטלה אלא לצורך הכרחי והם
 חלק מעצמו על כן שמוש כל אחד מאלה הכחות במצוה הוא
 מעלה מפני כי כל חלק מחלקי העצם מתנועה בטבע לשלמות
 העצם. ואמצעות הנפש המדברת החכמה ואמצעות הנפש הכעסנית
 הגבורה ואמצעות המתאווה היות האדם פורש מהתענוגים [75a]
 הגופניים אלא כפי הצורך והוא הנקרא בערבי עפה (88) והמצליח 15

87) The same is quoted in המעלות, 10, in the name of Aristotle. I have not found the passage in the latter's works. For the following sentences and for the division of men into three classes see המעלות, 37, 43-47, 70; Isaac Israeli's ספר היסודות, 57 f.; Gazzālī, *Ethics*, 37, 61; Abraham Ibn Ezra on Ex. 24, 25; Abraham Ibn Daud, אמונה רמה, beginning of III, p. 98; Maimonides, Comm. on Abot, 5, 21; see above, notes 10, 54.

88) عَظْفٌ, which is the equivalent to the Aristotelian σωφροσύνη. The author adds here the Arabic term because there is no adequate expression in Hebrew. The translators of Ibn Šaddīk (עולם קמן, ed. Horowitz, 38; comp. Horowitz, *Psychologie*, 198, n. 165), of Gazzālī (*Ethics*, 92), and Palquera himself (המעלות, 28, 45) use ענוה, those of Ibn Daud (l. c., 98) and Maimonides (*Eight Chapters*, 4) have הסתפקות and זהירות respectively, while Hillel b. Samuel of Italy (thirteenth century) in תגמולי הנפש, 42ab, 45b, uses כבישות. None of these translations expresses the Greek σωφροσύνη. Al-Jorjānī, *Ta'rifāt*, ed. Flügel, 156, l. 20 f., gives the following definition of the Arabic term: العفة هيئة للقوة

الشهوية متوسطة بين الفجور الذي هو افراط هذه القوة والجمود الذي وهو تقيطها فالعفيف من يباشر الامور عَلَى وفق الشرع والمرؤة
 "Temperance is a condition in the appetitive faculty which keeps the mean

מבני אדם מי שנודמן לו בנערותו להתעסק בחכמות הלמודיות
 לא בהבלי המשוררים שדבריהם בשבח בני אדם. והנטיה אל
 החכמה ואהבתה דבר אלהי גדול מאוד אין צרך בו לחקירה ועיון
 אם הוא כן אם לא ואהבת הגדולה והמשרה חלי הנפש. ודבר
 5 מלול (89) ברור כי כל המדות הטובות והפכן מבוארות בתורתנו
 הקדושה ובדברי הנביאים ע"ה והוסיף בבאורן שלמה ע"ה [75b]
 במשלי וקהלת.

השער השני. מפני שיש אמת בדבור הפנימי (90) ראיתי

between licentiousness (*ἀκολασία*), which is the latter's going into excess, and insensibility (*ἀναίσθησία*), which is its deficiency. The temperate man then is he who acts in conformity with the demands of law and manhood." Ibn Kūtaiba (ninth century), *ʿUjūn al-Aḥbār*, ed. Brockelmann, 375 relates: قال المطرف لابنه يا بني الحسنه بين السيئين يعني

بين الافراط والتقصير وخير الامور اوساطها وشر السير الحق حقه
 "Said Almutarrāf to his son, O my son! the good lies between two evils, that is between excess and deficiency; the noblest part of all things is their mean, and the worst kind of procedure is running." Comp. *Nicom. Ethics*, II, 7, p. 1107b, ll. 4-8; Goldziher, *Kitāb ma'āni al-nafs*, 18-20; Gazzālī, *Ethics*, 92; comp. also Sifrē, בהעלותך, beginning, and Talmud Men. 98b; see my article *JQR.*, 1910, p. 160, n. 15. To the references given there are to be added Ibn Aknin, ספר מוסר, p. 26 f.; Moses Ibn Ḥabīb on עולם, 24b; Simon Duran מנן אבות, 48ab; Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, דרשות (Venice), 7c, 11b, 35b, 49d. The immediately following passage והמצליח מבני אדם, etc., is found verbatim in מבקש, 24b, המעלות, 47, and is probably adopted by Palquera from the "Brethren of Purity"; comp. Dieterici, *Die Abhandlungen der Ichwan Eṣ-Ṣafā*, p. 614, bottom: ومن أسعد السعادات ان يتفق لك يا اخي

معلم رشيد عارف بحقائق الامور الخ. The respective portion in the was translated into German by M. Sachs, *Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, Berlin 1845, p. 345.

89) See Job 33, 3. The usage is peculiar; see, however, Hadassi, אשכול, Alphab. 163, ל', 164, ט'.

90) That is truth in thought; comp. above, p. 462, and המעלות, 35. Ibn Aknin, ספר מוסר, 78, l. 25. Maimonides, *Eight Chapters*, II, הלכות עכו"ם, II, 3, claims that right or wrong thinking and opining even when not followed by any actual deed, are also to be included in the category of lawful or sinful actions, though no command or prohibition is applicable to such actions; comp. Scheyer, *Das psychologische System des*

לחלק זה השער לשני שערים הראשון באמת התלויה בדבר שפתים ואע"פ שזה ממין מה שקדם למעלה מהמדות היצירות [היצירות ז.]. והשני באמת התלויה בציור.

השער הראשון. שפת אמת תכון לעד ועד ארגיע[ה] לשון 5
 שקר (91) צונו בוראנו יתעלה בתורתו שנדבר אמת ונרחק מהכזב
 באמרו (92) מדבר שקר תרחק ו שנדרוף היושר שהוא הצדק כאמרו
 (93) צדק צדק תדרוף ואמרו ז"ל (94) הן [הין ז.]. צדק יהיה לך
 שיהיה הן שלך צדק ולאן שלך צדק. והפילוסוף הידוע ליונים (95)
 אמר והצדק שהוא היושר [76a] הוא החזק השלמיות כלם ופעליו
 פעלים נפלאים יותר נפלאים מהכוכב הזורח בבקר ובערב כי 10
 הצדק מעלה שלמה ע"כ. וזו המדה כלומר הרחקת הכזב והדבקות
 באמת שיהיה דבורו באמונה ולא ישנחו הוא מהמדות המעולות
 ומורה על גדולת נפש בעליה כמו שאמרו (96) על אותו חכם דאי
 יהבם [יהבי ז.]. ליה כל חללי עלמא לא הוה משנה דבוריה ואמר
 (97) החכם אמור האמת ואע"פ שתירא היזקה ואל תאמר הכזב 15
 ואע"פ שתקוה תועלתו. ויש מבני אדם גדולי הנפש מאוד ומוסרים
 עצמם להרג כדי לפרנסם [לפרסם ז.]. האמת כמו שמצאנו
 באברהם ע"ה ובשאר האבות והנביאים ע"ה ואין ראוי ליחס זה

Maimonides, Frankf. a. M. 1845, pp. 103, 106; Rosin, *Die Ethik des Maimonides*, Breslau 1876, p. 55, n. 1; Ibn Akin, *מוסר*, p. 49, l. 25 f., p. 50, l. 5; Simon Duran, *מגן אבות*, III, 37a, 48a.

91) Prov. 12, 19.

92) Ex. 23, 7.

93) Deuter. 16, 20.

94) Baba Mez. 49a.

95) Refers to the Stagirite; comp. above p. 467. The passage to which Dr. Husik of the Gratz College called my attention occurs in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, p. 1129b, ll. 27-31: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλὰ κτὶ κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ ἢ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ οὐθ' ἴσπερος οἷτε ἕως θανραστῶς... καὶ τελεία μάλιστα ἀρετή. It seems to be a quotation from Homer which I have not investigated any further; comp. J. E. C. Welldon, *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*, London 1892, p. 137, n. 1; see also A. Ibn Daud, והיושר ראש מעלות המדות 99, 101: אמונה רמה.

96) Baba Mez. 49a; Sanh. 97a with slight variants.

97) I do not know to whom he refers nor have I found a parallel in the other works of our author.

הפעל אלא להם ולדומים [76b] להם כי הוא פעל אלהי והפעל
האלהי לא יוחם [ייוחס. r.] אלא לאנשים האלהיים מבני אדם
(98) והודעת האמת מיוחסת אל החכמה העליונה כאמרו (99)
הלא חכמה תקרא וגומר ואמר אחרי כן (100) כי אמת יהנה חכי
5 ותועבת שפתי רשע בצדק כל אמרי פי אין בהם נפתל ועקש.
וכמו שדבור האמת מהמדות המעולות כן דבור הכזב מהמדות
הגרועות ובעליו כאלו אינו אדם אמתי. ויפה אמר האומר (101)
כי עקר חיי האדם האמת ומי שאינו מדבר אמת בטלו חייו.
ואפשר כי מפני שאין בפי הרשעים נכונה וקרבת הוות נקראו
10 בחייהם (מתים 102) ודי במה שנאמר (103) בדובר השקר דבר
שקרים לא יכון לנגד עיניי ושלמה מנה אותו (104) בשש הנה
שנא ה' ואמר (105) יפיח כזבים עד שקר והנה יפיח כזבים ועד
שקר ענין אחד וקרא [77a] למכזב עד שקר ואמר (106) תועבת י"י
שפתי שקר ועשי אמונה רצונו ור"ל העושה מה שעושה באמונה.
15 ואמר (107) מציל נפשות עד אמת כי הנותן לזולתו העצה ההוגנת
לו ומדבר באמת מציל נפשו והפכו מי שכזב ומרמה אותו בדבריו
הוא ממיתו כענין לשון שקר ישנא דכיו ופה חלק יעשה מדחת.
(108) ויפה פרשו האומרים (109) כי ענין ארור מכה רעהו בסתר

98) Comp. המעלות, 51.

99) Prov. 8, 1.

100) *Ib.*, 8, 7-8.

101) Source unknown to me; comp., however, Maimonides, *Guide*, I, 42.

102) Berakot 18b, Maimonides, *l. c.*; see particularly Goldziher, *Kitāb ma'āni al-naḥs*, 50. To the interesting references given there may be added Baṭlayūsi, עגולות, 27 and 52: ואמר אחד מבעלי הדמות האנשים ישנים וכאשר
מחו הקיצו.

103) Ps. 101, 7.

104) Prov. 6, 18.

105) *Ib.*, 6, 19.

106) *Ib.*, 12, 22.

107) *Ib.*, 14, 25.

108) *Ib.*, 26, 28.

109) Palquera seems to have made a mistake here. The passage to which he alludes is in Sifra, section קרושים, c. II, § 14, referring to Lev. 19, 14. The author, misled by his memory, brought it in connec-

110) במכשילו בעצתו ואמר החכם 111) כי הכזב שרש הדברים
 הרעים והצדק קיום הנבראים. ואמר 112) ויש מכזב מפני התענוג
 בכזב ויש מכזב מפני הריוח כקוסם ורופא וידוע כי מדת
 הכזב מביאה למדת החנופה ושיהיה האדם חנף ודי במה שנאמר
 113) כמי כי בוז המדה כי לא לפניו חנף יבוא. ואמר החכם [77b] 5
 הידוע ליונים 114) והמכזב יותר טוב מהחנף כי הוא מכזב בדבורו
 בלבד והחנף מכזב בדבורו ובפעלו. והגם הרוח הוא יותר רע
 משניהם מפני שהוא [רואה] בנפשו (ולה) מה שאין לה ואמרו
 ז"ל 115) כי העולם עומד על האמת.

10 השער השני. זה השער ליי צדיקים יבאו בו 116) אומר כי
 האמת בשכל העיוני כטוב בשכל האנושי 117) וכמו שכל אדם
 יתאוה אל הטוב ואליו כונתם אלא שהם לא ידעו מה הוא כמו כן
 רוב המעיינים יתאוו להשיג האמת ואליה כונתם אלא שהמשיגים
 מעטים והאדם מצטרך בהשגת האמת לסיוע אלהי כמו ששאל
 15 דוד 118) הדריכני באמתך ולמדני כי אתה אלהי ישעי כי אותך

(בעל הטורים) tion with Deuter. 27, 24; comp., however, Jacob b. Asher (on Deuter. 27, 18, who quotes the same interpretation in connection with the verse last mentioned, for which I do not know the source; comp. also Hdassi, אשכל, 349, letter 'ג', 350, 'ב'.

110) Deuter. 27, 24.

111) Comp. *Nicom. Ethics*, IV, 7, p. 1127a, l. 28 ff.

112) This is a short rendition of Aristotle, *Ethics*, I. c., p. 1127b, ll. 10-20, where also occurs the exemplification *ὁλον μάντιν, σοφόν, ἱατρόν*; comp. מבקש, 15b. In מועלות, 59, Aristotle is quoted directly and the passage given more in full.

113) Job 13, 16; comp. b. Soṭah 41b, 42a.

114) *Nicom. Ethics*, I. c. I have corrected the text of the quotation in accordance with the parallel passage in המעלות, 59, adding רואה and eliminating the word ולה which gives no sense. Comp. Baḥya, *Duties* V, 4; VII, 8; Honein's Apophthegms, I, 5: ארסטוטליס הכזב והחנף שתי סבות לחשוף כל סתר ולהפך כל אחיה.

115) Abot, I, 17; comp. b. Taan. 7b; Baba Batra 78b; Pes. 66b.

116) Ps. 118, 20.

117) Comp. Ibn Ṣaddīq, עולם קטן (ed. Horovitz), 67, l. 8-10; Mehren, *Les rapports de la philosophie d'Arvicenne avec l'Islam*, Louvain 1883, p. 13.

118) Ps. 25, 5.

קויתי כל היום [78a] והאמת תושג בדרך אחת היא שרש האמת
ועקרה ומקורה ויש דרך שנית והיא כטפלה לראשונה. והדרך
הראשונה שהיא שרש ועקר ומקור לאמת היא ידיעת התורה ומה
שנכלל בה מהדעות האמתיות כמציאות השם ברוך הוא ויחודו
והמצאתו לשאר הנמצאים מההעדר והשגחתו באישי בני אדם 5
ובמיני (119) שאר הנבראים והשכר והענש ושנותו הטבע על יד
מי שירצה מעבדיו ומה שדומה לאלה הדעות המבוארות ומה
שבארו החכמים ז"ל מהם ממה שנרמזו בתורה וידיעת דברי
הנביאים ע"ה והמדברים ברוח הקדש (120) כי בעמוד החכם
האמתי על אמתת [78b] דבריהם יתבארו לו מהן סודות אלהיות 10
ודעות אמתיות נשגבו מחכמי המחקר וכן שאל המדבר ברוח
הקדש גל עיני ואביטה נפלאות מתורתך (121) צדקתך צדק לעולם
ותורתך אמת (122) משפטי יי אמת צדקו יחדו (123) צדק עדותיך
לעולם הבינני ואחיה (124). ובאמת כי האמת נודעת ונאצלת מן התורה
שקדמה לעולם (125) והמשיגה ויודע מה היה [היא ר.] כי היא 15
משיבת נפש והעדות מה הם שהם צדק ולא ישתנו לעולם והמבינים
[והמבינים ר.] תחיה נפשו לעולם והמשפטים שהם אמת וצדקו
יחדיו ואין בהם כזב לעולם ולא שנוי מה הם (126) הוא הרואה בעין
השכל שהם אמת [79a] ורשומים בכתב אמת (127) שלא ימחה

119) The change in the expression באישי — במיני is significant; see above, note 15.

120) See note 82.

121) Ps. 119, 18.

122) *Ib.*, 119, 142.

123) *Ib.*, 19, 10.

124) *Ib.*, 119, 144.

125) Ps. 54a, Ned. 39b.

126) The text is in disorder. The words מה הם seem to be an erroneous repetition from l. 16. The sense is: He who grasps the meaning of the Torah (המשיגה) and knows what it is—"restoring the soul" (Ps. 19, 8) —, and what its precepts are—"righteous and unchangeable"—, will realise that it is Truth.

127) A phrase taken from Dan. 10, 21.

לעולם וכל הדברים האמתיים נתנו מרעה אחד (128) הוא לבדו אמת. והדרך השנית כענף וכטפלה לראשונה הם דברי חכמי המחקר (129) האמתיים מהם המורים על אמתת דבריהם המושכלות הראשונות ויש אומרים כי אמתת אלה המושכלות נודע מצד החוש ושהחוש נותן אותם ואחרים אומרים כי הן נאצלות מהנותן השכל לאדם (130) גם יש אומרים כי אל זה נרמז בתפלה באמרנו [אתה] חונן לאדם דעת על כן ראוי לקבל מדבריהם מה שיעידו עליו אותן המושכלות ואינו סותר דבר מדברי התורה וקבלת רז"ל ואומר אני כי הראשונים שהיה לבם כפתחו של [79b] אולם (131) וקבלו מהנביאים ע"ה והמדברים ברוח הקדש (132) איש מפי איש והיו יושבים על אדמת השם ברוך הוא שאני והמחכים [שאוריה מחכים. 1.] (133) לא היו מצטרפים לדברי חכמי המחקר כי עין בעין היו רואים האמת אבל האחרונים שלכם כמחט סדקית (134) ונסתתם באורך הגלות ובשעבד האומות אותם הרוצה מהם שתהיה ידיעתו למציאות השם ויחודו מצד החקירה כדי לצרף אותה למה שידע מצד הקבלה האמתית צריך שילמוד ספרי חכמי המחקר האמתיים ולעמוד על ראיותיהם האמתיות במציאות השם ית' ויחודו וכמו שאמרו ז"ל (135) ששואלים לאדם בשעת פטירתו

128) Eccl. 12, 11; comp. Talm. Hag. 3b, to which passage the author alludes.

129) Refers mainly to peripatetic philosophers; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 6, n. 43.

130) See above note 10.

131) Erubin 53a; comp. מעירות, 66; Gazzālī, *Ethics*, 153; Maimonides, *הקדמת המשנה*, ed. Hamburger, p. 49.

132) See above, note 82.

133) Baba Batra 158b; comp. *Kusari*, II, 22, and Palquera, *מורה המורה*, 136.

134) Erubin, l. c.; comp. Maimonides, l. c., and *Guide*, I, 71.

135) Shabb. 31a; comp. מבקש, 32b, top: ומפני שידיעת החכמות הכרחית בשלמות האדם אמרו ז"ל ששואלים לאדם ביום הדיון קבעת עתים לתורה פלפלת בחכמה; Maimonides, *Guide*, III, 54, whence the whole is taken; comp. also Profiat Duran, מעשה אפר, 4; Simon Duran, Comm. on Abot, 3, 18.

אם פלפל בחכמה. ומה שיראה מדבריהם שהוא סותר דבר [80a]
 מדברי התורה או דברי חכמינו ז"ל אל ישגיח בו ואל יעלהו על
 לבו וישמע האמת מהאומרה (136) כאמרם ז"ל (137) ר' מאיר רמז
 מצא תוכו אכל קליפתו זרק. וזו הדרך תפשו החסידים שבישראל
 5 אחר חבור התלמוד במקצת הגאונים ז"ל ורבים מחכמי ספרד
 וביחוד הרמב"ם ז"ל שהפיץ מעין האמת חוצה וסתר מדברי
 חכמי המחקר מה שהם כנגד תורתנו. וספרי חכמי המחקר שיש
 בהם תועלת בהשיג האמת על דרך החקירה יש מהם שהם כמו
 הצעה וחדוד לשכל בחכמות [כחכמות י. 2] הלמודיות ויצטרך
 האדם ליגע שכלו. ויש מהם שהם מדברים השכל על האמת
 10 כספרי ההגיון. ומהם שמעיינים באמתות [80b] הנבראים
 ובעצמיהם כספרי הטבע. ומהם שמעיינים בדברים האלהיים
 כספרי חכמת האלהות והם התכלית אצלם. וכתב הרמב"ם (138)
 והרוצה להשיג תכלית השלמות האנושי יצטרך בהכרח להתעסק
 15 תחלה במלאכת ההגיון ואחר כן בלמודיות על הסדר ואחר כן
 בטבעיות ואחר כן באלהיות על כן [עד כאן י. 139] וספרי חכמי
 המחקר שרוב דבריהם אמתיים באלה הענינים ממה שהסכימו
 רוב חכמי המחקר שהם נוטים אל האמת יותר משאר הספרים
 הם ספרי ארצטו (*sic*) וספרי מפרשי ספריו כי הוברר [הוא ברר
 20 האמת מכל דברי חכמי המחקר שהיו לפניו וכתו י. 139] וכתב י.

136) See my article *JQR.*, 1910, p. 168, n. 31, also Simon Duran, *מגן אבות*, I, 2a, and on Abot 4, 25; Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, *דרשות*, 43a.

137) *Hagigah* 15b.

138) *Guide*, I, 34; comp. Ibn Akin, *ספר מוסר*, 116; Senior Sachs, *היונה*, 66.

139) This is an instance of the thoughtlessness or ignorance of our copyist. His original doubtless had the abbreviation ע"כ, which he read against all sense על כן. He repeats the same mistake three times in the following. The spelling ארצטו is also to be charged to his account.

אותה בספריו (140) וכתב הרמב"ם (141) וספרי ארצטו
מספיקים [81a] מכל אישר היו לפניו ושכלו הוא תכלית השכל
האנושי מלבד מי ששפע עליהם שפע אלהי והיו נביאים על בן
[עד כאן r.]. והנראה לי לקוצר דעתי כי הפליג רבנו ז"ל בזה.
5 והכם גדול (142) אמר כי הספקות בחמת [בחכמת r.] הטבע מועטים

מאזני צדק 140) Abraham Ibn Hisdai in his introduction to Gazzālī's
p. 2, has the same praise for Aristotle (from Al-Mas'ūdi?):
...ארסטו נקה דעות הפילוסופים כלם והניף בנפת דעו דרכי החכמים ומסלולם ולקח הסלת
והשליך הפסלת לקט לאחד אחד הדרכים הנקיים לדעת ולשמור את דרך עץ החיים
מלבד מה שחדש משכלו והוסיף נפך משלו בכמה חכמות ומומות והאמין בד'
He, too, adds the opinion of Maimonides.
quoted in the following by Palquera without, however, criticising Maimonides,
as does our author; see the following note.

141) קובץ תשובות הרמב"ם, Leipzig 1859, II, 28d. The text of
Palquera in this quotation is more correct than that in the קובץ and
agrees more with the one quoted from a manuscript by Kaufmann, *Die
Spuren des Al-Baṭlajūsi*, 39, n. 1. Palquera cites the same passage verbatim
in מורה המורה, 107, where read נביאים, שפע, לפניו, as in the present
treatise. His criticism of Maimonides in the last mentioned work, p. 106,
is even harsher than it appears here: אכל בכאן הפליג מורנו ז"ל וכמעט אומר:
It shows Palquera's independence of mind that he did
not shrink back from criticising his master, whom he otherwise so greatly
admirers, if, as in the case before us, he did not share his views.

142) This חכם גדול is none other than Gazzālī. The passage occurs in
his *Maḥāṣid-ul-Falāsifa*, a work in three parts treating of logic, metaphysics,
and physics, which I have prepared for publication from a manuscript
in the Royal Library of Berlin. Gazzālī begins his metaphysics with the
following remark: عادتهم جارية بتقديم الطبيعي ولكن آثرنا تقديم هذا

لانه اهم والخلاف فيه اكثر. "It is customary to treat physics
first, but I preferred to treat first of metaphysics, because it is
more subject to doubts and the opinions in metaphysical problems
differ more widely." It may be noted in passing that Gazzālī
was censured on account of this arbitrary deviation from the
accepted rule; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, X, 72 f., and *Hebr. Übers.*,
31, 310, especially Kaufmann, *Theologie des Bachja*, 24, note. Two pages
further Gazzālī says (in the Hebrew translation of Judah Nathan Bongodas,
manuscript of the same library, the Arabic original offering here a lacuna):
והיותר רחוקה מן השבוש בשלשת החכמות היא הלמודית ובחכמה הטבעית השבוש

ובחכמת האלהות רבים על כן [עד כאן r.]. ואין ספק כי
 הרוצה בזה הדור לסמוך אל מה שידע מצד התורה הידועה שהיא
 מצד המחקר צריך שיעמוד על דבריו (143) ושיאמין מהם המסכים
 עם אמונתנו ובלבד שלא יליוז מעיניו דברי הנביאים ולא יסורו
 מלכבו פן יפתה וידחה ויכפור בעקר ויקצץ בנטיעות ויצא לתרבות
 רעה כמו שיקרה למי שלא יקדים תורתו לחכמתו (144). ואומר כי
 הדבר המפורסם [81b] לחכמי לב כי האמת המושגת בכל
 הדברים הכונה בה ותכליתה להשיג האמת הראשונה שהיא מקור
 האמת והנותנת האמת לכל בעל אמת והיא לברה אמת כמו
 שאמר הנביא (145). וי"י אלהים אמת הוא אמת ואין זולתו אמת
 ור"ל כי המציאות הקיים הוא לבורא ית' לא לזולתו מהנמצאים
 והוא יותר הגון בשם המציאות שהוא האמת מזולתו משאר
 הנמצאים מפני שהוא מועיל המציאות לזולתו ומציאות זולתו
 תלוי בו ועל זה הדרך אמרו קצת מחכמי המחקר (146) שאין
 במציאות אלא הבורא יתעלה לבדו ואין זה הדבר ידוע בקבלה
 בלבד אלא הוא מושג מצד המחקר. והחקירה העצומה הצריך (sic)
 לחכמי המחקר [82a] להודות בזה הדבר ולפרסמו כי מאחר

בה יותר כי הטבעיות רחוקות מן הקיום להשתנותם והם בזה בחינה המודיות.
 He expresses himself similarly in the introduction to his work, which was
 published with the first chapter of the part treating of logic by Georg
 Beer, under the title *Al-Gazzālī's Maḳāṣid Al-Falāsifat*, Leiden 1888, p. 4:

ואما האלהיות פאכֶּתֶר עִקְאִדֶּם פִּיֶּהָ עָלֵי חֵלָף הַחֵק וְאַלְוָב נָאֵר פִּיֶּה
 וְאַמָּה מִנְטַקִּיָּת פִּאכֶּתֶרָהָ עָלֵי מִנְהֵג אֲלֻוָּב וְאַחְטָא נָאֵר פִּיֶּה ۰۰۰ וְאַמָּה

الطبيعيات فالحق فيها مشوب بالباطل والصواب فيها مشتبہ بالخطأ
 "As to metaphysics most of their dogmas are contradictory to truth,
 the correct being an exception; in logic most of the doctrines are on the
 right way and the false is an exception...In physics truth is
 mixed with error and what is correct thereof resembles the erroneous"
 (that is to say, the true doctrine is not discernible from the false in want
 of proper criteria). This passage was made use of by Palquera, מבקש, 33b,
 without reference to the source.

143) Refers to Aristotle.

144) Comp. Abot III, 9.

145) Jerem. 10, 10.; see above, note 10.

146) May refer to Baṭṭayūsī, see above, note 10.

שחבורא ית' הוא המועיל לזולתו המציאות והאמת לכל נמצא
 אם כן הוא יתעלה יותר מגון בשם המציאות האמת (sic) מכל
 הנמצאים כי הוא סבתם. ושמע מה שאמר החכם הידוע ליונים
 אמר 147) ומהנכון שתקרא החכמה העיונית ידיעת האמת מפני
 שתכליתה היא האמת ותכלית הידיעה [ה] המעשית המעשה.
 ומחמבואר כי אנחנו לא נדע האמת אם לא נדע עלתה וכל אחד
 מהדברים שימצא בהם המוקדם והמאוחר אותו הדבר שהוא
 בתכלית מהם הוא בלבד עלה לשאר הדברים שהם נאותים לו
 בשם והענין. ודמיון זה כי הדברים החמים ימצא בהם שחמימותו
 מועט ושחמימותו הרבה והשלם והחסר. והאש בתכלית [82b]
 החמימות מהם ועל כן יתחייב שתהיה האש היא העלה במציאות
 הדברים החמים וכל מה שהוא עלה לדבר הוא יותר מגון בשם

147) This lengthy quotation which is the basis for the preceding Personification of God as Truth (see above, note 10) is taken from Aristotle's *Metaphysics* à ἐλαττον end of c. I, p. 993b, ll. 19-31:

ὁρθῶς δ' ἔχει καὶ τὸ καλεῖσθαι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιστήμην τῆς ἀληθείας. θεωρητικῆς μὲν γὰρ τέλος ἀλήθεια, πρακτικῆς δ' ἔργον. [καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν τὸ πῶς ἔχει σκοπῶσιν, οὐ τὸ αἰδιον ἀλλὰ πρὸς τι καὶ νῦν θεωροῦσιν οἱ πρακτικοί] οὐκ ἴσμεν δὲ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἄνευ τῆς αἰτίας. ἕκαστον δὲ μά- λιστα αὐτὸ τῶν ἄλλων, καθ' ὃ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπάρχει τὸ συνώνυμον, οἷον τὸ πῦρ θερμότερον. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ αἰτιον τοῦτο τῆς θερμότητος. ὥστε καὶ ἀληθέστατον τὸ τοῖς ἰστέροις αἰτιον τοῦ ἀληθέσιν εἶναι. διὸ τὰς τῶν ἀεὶ ὄντων ἀρχὰς ἀναγκαῖον ἀεὶ εἶναι ἀληθεστάτας οὐ γάρ ποτε ἀληθεῖς, οὐδ' ἐκείναις αἰτιόν τι ἐστὶ τοῦ εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖναι τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὥσθ' ἕκαστον ὡς ἔχει τοῦ εἶναι, οἷτω καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Palquera's translation is based either on Averroes' "Middle" commentary, which contains also extracts of the Aristotelian text and which was used by our author also in his *דעות הפילוסופים*; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, beginning of §§ 84, 85; or on the "Long" Commentary which gives Aristotle's text in full. This accounts for the paraphrastic character of the translation as compared with the Greek original. The thought is rendered throughout with exactness. After המעשה (l. 6), however, a whole sentence of the Greek is omitted. The word לעלם (p. 495, l. 4) ought to be inserted also after הנמצאים (ib., l. 3), where it is of essential importance, corresponding to the Greek τὰς τῶν ἀεὶ ὄντων ἀρχάς. It seems, however, that the equivalent of ἀεὶ in the first place was wanting already in the Arabic translation, for it is omitted also in the translation

אותו הדבר וענינו מאותו הדבר ויתחייב מזה שיהיה מה שהוא
 עלה לדברים שהם אמת הוא יותר הגון בשם האמת. וכמו כן
 יתחייב שיהיו התחלות הדברים הנמצאים בתכלית המציאות
 והאמת לעולם כי אינן נמצאות פעם ולא נמצאות פעם ולא
 תמצא להם עלה בהיותן אמת מפני שלא תמצא להם עלה בהיותם
 5 נמצאות אבל הם עלה לשאר הדברים בהיותם אמת כי הם היו
 העלה בהיותם נמצאים וכל אחד מהדברים ענינו באמת כענינו
 במציאות וענינו במציאות כענינו באמת על כן [עד כאן r].
 .(148)

והנה התבאר כי השגת [83a] האמת היא המכוננת והתכלית
 והצדק שהוא יושר המעשים ומצוים הוא הצעה להשיג האמת
 והחסד שהוא עשיית המעשים הטובים לפנים משורת הדין הוא
 סבת השלום שבו קיום הנבראים (149) וכן נאמר במזמור (150) רצית
 י"י ארצך וגו' חסד ואמת נפגשו צדק ושלום נשקו (151) והודיע
 15 כי באותו הזמן היו נמצאות או שימצאו לעתיד לבוא המעלות
 הטובות היציריות והשכליות בבני ישראל וקרוב מיראיו ישעו
 (152) וראוין לשכון הכבוד בתוכם וכן נשקו החסד והשלום כלומר
 שדבקו זה בזה וזה תכלית בני אדם. ומפני הראות האמת

of Moses Ibn Tibbon (not "Hillel of Verona," as Kaufmann, *Attributenlehre*, 334, has it; see Steinschneider, Introduction to תגמולי הנפש, 13), in חמדה גנוזה, f. 32a, see with reference to that passage above, note 10; comp. also Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übers.*, 174, n. 498. For נמצאות in the phrase כי אינן נמצאות פעם ולא נמצאות פעם (l. 4) it ought to be in both places אמתיות. Moses Ibn Tibbon, *l. c.*, has correctly עת לאינן אמתיות עת בלא עת $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \mu\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, so also Moses Ibn Habib, Comm. on בחינת עולם, Ferrara 1552, fol. 86b; comp. also Kaufmann, *Attributenlehre*, p. 334, end of note 204.

148) See above, note 139.

149) Mishnah Abot I, end; comp. Maimonides, *ad locum*: וכבר בארנו בפרק ה' שהאמת הוא המעלות השכליות והשלום הוא מעלות המדות וכשימצאו
 אלו השלשה יהיה המציאות בשלמות שאפשר לו בלא ספק
 comp. *ib.*, 5, 21.

150) Ps. 85, 2.

151) *Ib.*, verse 11.

152) *Ib.*, verse 10.

באותו הזמן בארץ אמר (153) אמת מארץ תצמח ושנשקף משמים
הצדק [83b] כלומר שיהיו נראים לכל.

וראיתי לחתום זו האגרת כמה שדרשו ז"ל בבראשית רבה
(154) בזה הפסוק. אמרו בשעה שבא הקב"ה לברוא אדם נעשו
מלאכי השרת כתות כתות מהם אומרים (155) יברא ומהם אומרים 5
אל יברא ה"ד חסד ואמת נפגשו חסד אומר יברא שהוא גומל
חסדים ואמת אומר אל יברא שהוא מלא שקרים צדק אומר יברא
שהוא מלא צדקות ושלוש אומר אל יברא דכולי[ה] קטטה מה
עשה הב"ה נטל האמת והשליכה ארצה ה"ד (156) ותשלך אמת
ארצה אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הב"ה מה אתה מבזה טכסין 10
ואלטומסין [תכסים אלטיכסייה. 1.] שלך תעלה אמת מן הארץ
הה"ד אמת מארץ תצמח וזה ענין נכבד מאוד.

153) *Ib.*, verse 12.

154) Chapter VIII, § 5.

155) The manuscript erroneously repeats מהם after אומרים.

156) Dan. 8, 12.

APPENDIX

IBN HISDAI

ואולי החושב יחשוב שהצורה הראשונה היא מקרה ולא עצם אם כן נודיעהו הפסד מחשבתו מהאדם כי האדם מורכב מנפש וגוף וגופו יסודו וחמרו הנושא צורתו ונפשו צורתו וקיום בעל מינו והנפש איננה מקרה כי היא עצם ידוע אצל השכל ואם יכחישוה ויאמר שהיא מקרה בעבור שהיא נפרדת מן הגוף וחשב שכל נפרד מדבר הוא הקרה מפני שדין המקרה להפריד מנושאו נאמר לו שהמקרה איננו מקרה להפרידו מנושאו ואולם שב מקרה להפסדו אחר הפרידו מנושאו והנפש

PALQUERA

[84a] וכתב יצחק הישראלי בספר היסודות (157) וטעה חושב יחשוב כי הצורה הראשונה מקרה ואינה עצם בידעיתו הפסד זה מן האדם כי האדם מורכב מנפש וגוף וגופו יסודו וחמרו ונפשו צורתו והנפש אינה מקרה אך היא עצם ידוע עם השכל. ואם יכחיש זה ויאמר שהיא מקרה בעבור שהיא נפרדת וחשב שכל נפרד מדבר שהוא מקרה מפני שדין המקרה להפריד מנושאו לא דבר נכון כי אולם שב מקרה להפסדו אחר הפרידו מנושאו והנפש אינו כן כי היא קיימת נשאת אחר פרידתה

157) For a general discussion of this appendix see above, p. 468 f. The text as compared with that in Israeli's ספר היסודות, 12, is in many instances corrupt. I have corrected obvious grammatical mistakes and inserted entire phrases which were evidently omitted by the copyist on account of homoioteleuta. The whole passage is quoted also by Gerson b. Solomon, שער השמים, 58a, 59b (ed. Rödelheim, 80a, 82a), and Meir Aldabi, שבילי אמונה, end of c. 6; see Fried. I. c., 51-53. Of the three proofs for the immortality of the soul the third is used also by Joseph Ibn Aknin, the noted disciple of Maimonides, in the fragment printed in קובץ תשובות, עולם קטן, 34, has the first proof, but in a different form; comp. Horovitz, *Die Psychologie etc.*, 169, n. 64-65; see also *ib.*, 166, n. 58; comp. Aaron b. Elijah, עין חיים, c. 169.

מהגוף. והמופת על זה מושלשה פנים שהנפש אלו היתה מקרה עברה גוף ב"ה ויצא [ויצאה .r.] ממנו אל זולתו [84b] כיציאת שחרות הכושי לעץ האבונוס (158) ואין הנפש כן שהיא לא תמצא בזולת ב"ה. והמופת השני אלו היתה מקרה [היתה אם מקרה] דבק או נפרד ואי זה משניהם היה ראוי שיהיה לו מי שיעמוד תחתיו יכנסו יחד תחת סוג אחד ויהיה נקרא בשמו ונגבל בגבולו ויהיו שוים במאמר אחד כמו הלבון והשחרות ואין אנו מוצאים כן בנפש כי אנחנו לא נמצא לה תמורה וגואל שישכון בגוף אחר הפרדה ממנו. ואם אמר שהמות (159) בא אחריה הוא הפכה נאמר לו אלו היתה כן אז נקבצו שניהם במאמר אחד תחת גבול אחד וקבלו שם מכללם וגבולם (160) ואין הרבר כן שהנפש עצם משלים הגוף טבעי בעל כליי (sic) חי בכח (161) והמות

איננה כן כי היא קיימת נשארת אחר הפרדה מן הגוף. והנה ילקח מופת בזה מג' פנים הא' שהנפש אלו היתה מקרה עברה גוף ב"ה ויצאה ממנו אל זולתו כיציאת שחרות הכושי אל עץ האבונוס (158) ואין הנפש כן שהיא לא תמצא בזולת ב"ה. והמופת השני אלו היתה מקרה [היתה אם מקרה] דבק או נפרד ואי זה משניהם היה ראוי שיהיה לו מי שיעמוד תחתיו יכנסו יחד תחת סוג אחד ויהיה נקרא בשמו ונגבל בגבולו ויהיו שוים במאמר אחד כמו הלבון והשחרות ואין אנו מוצאים כן בנפש כי אנחנו לא נמצא לה תמורה וגואל שישכון בגוף אחר הפרדה ממנו. ואם אמר שהמות (159) בא אחריה הוא הפכה נאמר לו אלו היתה כן אז נקבצו שניהם במאמר אחד תחת גבול אחד וקבלו שם מכללם וגבולם (160) ואין הרבר כן שהנפש עצם משלים הגוף טבעי בעל כליי (sic) חי בכח (161) והמות

158) *Ebony wood*; see Fried, *ad locum*; Horovitz, *l. c.*

159) In the manuscript this word is followed by שפררה with two dots above the letters which is to indicate that the scribe wrote it by mistake.

160) The text seems to be corrupt; it is perhaps to be read: מכללם
ט:~:

161) This is the well known Aristotelian definition of the soul (*ἐγγελέχεια ἢ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ ὁργανικοῦ*), which was accepted by nearly all Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages; see Steinschneider, *Magazin*

והם אינם כן שהנפש הוא עצם משלים גוף טבעי בעל כלי בעל חיות בכח והמות הוא פרידת הנפש מן הגוף א"כ המות הוא הפך מציאות הנפש בגוף לא הפך הנפש. והג' שאנחנו מוצאים פעל הנפש עובר מגופה אל הדברים הרחוקים ממנה כי נמצאה תחשוב ותדמה ותעשה בדברים היוצאים מגופה עד שתעמוד על אמתתם מבלי שתקבצם אצלה ואם פעל הנפש יעבור גופה ויצא ממנו אל מה שנרחק מבלי הפסד כל שכן שעצמה הוא יותר ראוי בזה מפעולתה ואם לא אז תהיה פעולתה נכבדת יותר מעצמה ומן השקר שתהיה הפעולה יותר נכבדת מהעצם הפועל בעבור כי הפעולה באה מאת הפועל ולא הפועל מאת הפעולה מפני שהפועל עצם והפעולה מקרה ואין ספק שהעצם יותר נכבד מהמקרה

[85a] פרידת הנפש אם כן היא [הוא ז.] הפך מציאות הנפש בגוף (162). והמופת השלשי אנו מוצאים פעל הנפש עובר מגופה אל הדברים היוצאים ממנה כי נמצא[ה] תתבונן ותשכיל ותעשה בדברים היוצאים מגופה עד שתעמוד על אמתתם מבלי [שתקבצם] אצלה ואם פעל הנפש יעבור גופו [גופה ז.] ויצא ממנה (sic) למקום רחוק מבלי הפסד עצמה כ"ש שעצמה היא [הוא ז.] יותר ראוי לזה שאם לא כן תהיה פעולתה יותר נכבדת [מעצמה ומן השקר שתהיה הפעולה יותר נכבדת מהעצם הפועל בעבור כי הפעולה היא באה מאת הפועל לא הפועל מאת הפעולה מפני שהפועל עצם והפעולה מקרה] ואין ספק שהעצם יותר נכבד מהמקרה] אם כן הנפש יותר נכבדת מפעולתה ואם

ארכטוטליס *f. d. Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1892, p. 256, and my article in the Hebrew Encyclopædia **אוצר ישראל**, II, 209, 213; see also Moses Ibn Ezra, *Zion*, II, 159, last line; Joseph Ibn Akinin, *l. c.*, and in **ספר מוסר**, p. 172, l. 30; Levi ben Gerson, **מלחמות ה'** (1866), 249; Simon Duran, **מגן אבות**, II, 13a. Avicenna, following Aristotle, gives the same definition

(النفس) كمال اول جسم (ZDMG., XXIX, 346; Landauer, *ib.*, 380):
طبيعي-آلي... ذي حياة بالقوة.

162) The words **לא הפך הנפש** in Ibn Hisdai's text are of essential importance and seem to be omitted here only by the scribe. They are found also in the quotations of Gerson b. Solomon and Meir Aldabi.

אם כן הנפש יותר נכבדת
מפעולתה ואם פעולתה תעבור
גופה מבלי שתפסד קל וחמר
שהיא ראויה לזה יותר ממנה
אם כן באמת היא קיימת ונשארת
אחר הפרדה מן הגוף.

פעולתה תעבור גופה מבלי תפסד
קל וחמר שהיא ראויה [85b]
לזה יותר אם כן באמת היא
קיימת ונשארת אחר הפרדה
מהגוף. עד כאן.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE ARTICLE "SHEM TOB BEN JOSEPH PALQUERA" (in this volume, p. 151 ff.).

P. 152, note 1: see also Steinschneider, *Arab. Literatur*, p. XII.

P. 153, line 6, from bottom ("There also appeared...") read: There *and* in Spain.

P. 156, line 5. from bottom read ופלל for ופלל.

P. 159, note 13: the epigram quoted there occurs with some variants only in the first edition, Constantinople s. a. (1577), fol. 26. Zabara does not seem to be the author, because he, to, introduces it by ועליו אמר המשוור (communication of Dr. Israel Davidson).

P. 163, note 21 read בדיתים for בדיתים.

P. 163, note 22: on the phrase להעיר הנפש משנת העצלה comp. Steinschneider, *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, XIX, 258, No. 2.

P. 165, note 24: the fourth line of that note is an erroneous repetition of the preceding second line, and should read "far be it that the Torah should contain anything that is contradicted by sense-perception." For other authors, who expressed the same view see the references given by H. Jaulus, *Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1874, p. 455, n. 2, p. 459, last line.

P. 169, note 31: on the sentences discussed in that note comp. Goldziher, *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Toumert*, Introduction, p. 75, n. 3, and p. 106; for the sentence of 'Ali see Ya'kūbi, *Historiae*, ed. Houtsma, II, 248, bottom. I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. Goldziher.

P. 171, last line read שקולים for שקולי.

P. 177, note 50; according to Moses Rieti, Judah Halevi, regretting his previous occupation with poetry, burned his poems; comp. Simon Duran, *מגן אבות*, II, 55b, line 12.

P. 178: The lines in the epigram No. 3 were mixed up in print and should read:

If sin thou wouldst avoid, then speak but once,
And listen twice,—thus speech with silence season!
For the Creator gave thee just *one* mouth,
But gave thee *two* ears for that very reason!

Palquera's epigram is found in a more elaborate form in Joseph Kimḥi's *שקל הקדש* (Zion, II, 99); see also Abraham Ibn Hisdai, *בן המלך והנזיר*, c. 26; Simon Duran, *Commentary on Abot*, I, 16.

P. 179: To the list of authors, who quote Palquera, are to be added MOSES BOTAREL (1409); see Steinschneider, *Alfārabi*, 252, col. 2, line 5 (dubious), and SIMON DURAN (died 1444), *מגן אבות*, II, 30a, who quotes a passage from Palquera's *מורה המורה* (p. 7) in the name of the author.

THE ANCIENT JEWISH ALLEGORISTS IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH

By JACOB Z. LAUTEBBACH, Hebrew Union College

(Concluded)

THE *Dorshe Hamurot* are to be distinguished strictly from the *Dorshe Reshumot*. Likewise allegorists, they were, however, of another kind, and they used an altogether different method, and had a different tendency from the former. Their peculiar method and tendency can be learned from a few sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot* that have been preserved. It may properly be assumed a priori that the meaning of the name "Hamurot" must express and characterize this peculiar method and tendency. In determining the meaning of the name of the *Dorshe Hamurot* and the character of their interpretation, the interpretations of scriptural passages that are described in the Talmud as כמין חמר must also be considered; they will be found of the same kind and character as the interpretations of the *Dorshe Hamurot*. The phrase כמין חמר actually means "in the style or according to the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot*" (comp. Weiss, *Middot Soferim* on Mekilta Mishp., 83 b, and Bacher, *Terminologie*, s. חמר). This is satisfactorily proven by the fact that a saying in Tosefta B. K. described as being כמין חמר is in another place ascribed to the *Dorshe Hamurot* (Semahot viii). It may, therefore, be assumed with certainty that חמר

is the singular form of חמורות, and both have, of course, the same meaning. This meaning we must establish in order to arrive at a correct definition of the name *Dorshe Hamurot* and the method it characterizes.

In trying to find the meaning of the words חמר and חמורות, we must consider only the reading with ה, *homer* and *hamurot*, which is the correct one, and leave out of account the various readings giving the form of these words as *homer* or *hamurot*, with ח, as there is no reliable authority in support of the latter.³⁷ As in the case of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, we must reject the definitions of the word חמר and חמורות given by some of the old commentators³⁸ and accepted by Bacher (*l. c.*). According to these definitions חמר, like the Aramaic חומרא or חומרתא, means "a string of pearls" or "a bunch of spices." An interpretation characterized כמין חמר is therefore as precious as pearls or as racy and delicious in taste as a cluster of aromatic spices. The *Dorshe Hamurot*, then, would be a class of interpreters whose interpretations of scriptural passages are as precious and valuable as jewels, or as pungent and fine as the pleasant fragrance of spices.

But this characterization of these ancient interpreters of the Scripture and their interpretations is vague and unsatisfactory. It is true, we find in the Talmud that a very good interpretation is figuratively called a pearl, as, for instance, in the phrase מרגלית טובה היתה בידכם ובקשתם לאברהם

³⁷ Bacher, *l. c.*, 62, n. 3, says that in interpreting the word חמר, one must ignore the reading with ח, although the latter is endorsed by Saadia and the Aruk, but we shall see that it is at least doubtful whether Saadia and the Aruk had the reading with ח.

³⁸ Rashi in *Kiddushin* 22, s. 2^o. כמין חמר, says צרור המרגליות וצרור הכושם תלוי בצואר לתכשיט. Similarly *Tosafot Soṭah* 15a, in the name of R. Hillel כמין חמר פירש ר' הלל מרגליות ענין אחר כושם.

ממני, "You had a valuable pearl [that is, a very good interpretation], and you wanted to withhold it from me" (Ḥagigah 3a; comp. also Baba Batra 123b). But one cannot call a whole class of exegetes "interpreters of pearls," because their interpretations are choice, for other interpreters may also give excellent interpretations, and goodness and excellency in general are not terms with which to characterize a whole class as distinguished from another class. Besides, as appears from some remark in the Midrash, these interpretations were not considered unexceptional by the rabbis. In Midrash Bemid. Rabba ix. 39, and in Sifre Num. sec. 8, where the saying of R. Gamaliel characterized as כמין חמר is mentioned, the words אבל נראה, "but it seems correct," or "it is plausible," follow after the words כמין חמר. If כמין חמר is meant to characterize this interpretation as exceptionally good, "precious" and valuable "as a jewel," what need is there to add that it seems to be plausible? It does not sound coherent to say: "This explanation is excellent, it is as precious as a jewel, and it appears also to be correct." The expression אבל נראה, "but it seems plausible," following the words כמין חמר, indicates rather that the interpretations of the "kind of *homer*" were not considered very good, their value and correctness were rather doubtful, so that the commendatory phrase, אבל נראה "but it is plausible, it seems correct," had to be added, to make an interpretation of the kind acceptable.

It is evident, then, that חמר expresses a peculiar characteristic of the interpretations of the *Dorshe Ḥamurot* and their method, not merely the vague description "like a pearl," or "like spices." And whatever this peculiar characteristic may be, it must be actually found in the sayings and interpretations ascribed to the *Dorshe Ḥamurot*, or described as כמין חמר. For, as said above (p. 292), any theory about

the *Dorshe Hamurot* must have the support of all the evidence derivable about them from all the different sources of information. Judged by this standard, all the theories about the *Dorshe Hamurot* advanced by modern scholars prove to be either absolutely false or, at least, unsatisfactory. Weiss' theory, that the characteristic of the *Dorshe Hamurot* was that they interpreted the Scriptures according to the rule or method of "measure for measure," מדה כנגד מדה (*Middot Soferim* on *Mekilta Mishp.*, 83b), does not in any way explain why the name דורשי חמורות was given to these interpreters and how the word חמר or חמורות indicates the method of "measure for measure." Besides, as will be seen from the quoted sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, they are not at all conceived according to the rule "measure for measure." Even in those sayings described as כמין חמר, which at first sight resemble interpretations according to the "measure for measure" rule, there is something peculiar to the former that distinguishes them from the latter, and in *Soṭah* 15a an interpretation according to the *homer* method, כמין חמר, is in direct contrast to an interpretation according to the method "measure for measure" (see below, p. 514 f.). Kohut's³⁹ theory, that the *Dorshe Hamurot* were those interpreters of the Scriptures who applied the method of analogy, *Gezerah Shawah*, is absolutely without foundation. There is not the slightest resemblance between the method used in the interpretations of the *Dorshe Hamurot* and the *Gezrah Shawah* method, and not a single one of the sayings described as כמין חמר can support this theory. Besides, this theory is based upon the incorrect reading חמר instead

³⁹ *Aruch Completum*, s. v. דורשי חמורות הם בעלי הדרשנים אשר: חמר: הביאו דוגמאות ע"י גזירה שוה לבאר על ידה איזה ענין מבוקש. ופי' כמין חומר בעין גזירה שוה.

of חמר, and upon a doubtful etymology of the word from the Persian (see Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, I, 181ff.).

Isidor Weil's theory⁴⁰ (*REJ.*, III, 276 ff.) that the *Dorshe Hamurot* were those interpreters who tried to explain the secrets of the law, and find reasons for the commandments, טעמי המצות, is not supported by the interpretations preserved. For, as will be shown, the explanations given by the *Dorshe Hamurot* are altogether different in character from those so often found in the Talmud, that seek to give the reason, מפני מה אמרה תורה, "why the law has commanded this or that." And while Joseph Perles (*ibid.*, 109 ff.) is correct in considering the *Dorshe Hamurot* allegoristic interpreters of the Scriptures, he fails to define their peculiar method, and identifies them with the other allegorists, the *Dorshe Reshumot*. Besides, he does not explain the name *Hamurot*, as he bases his theory on the incorrect reading תמורות⁴¹, taking it to be like תמורות.

⁴⁰ This theory is also held by Weiss in his *Dor*, I, 202, where he describes the *Dorshe Hamurot* as those who seek to give a reason for the law; see above p. 297, note 8.

⁴¹ The reading תמורות and חמר is supposed to be supported by the Aruk and Saadia, but it is at least doubtful whether Saadia and the Aruk had this reading. It is true, in the Aruk, s. v. חמר, we read as follows: פי' תשובת רב סעדיה יש גורסין חומר ומפרשין להחמיר עליו אבל אנו גורסין חומר בה"א ופי' כמין מעשה שכן קורין המעשה בלשון ארמית איהמרא ובי יפגשו זה את זה אומר לחבירו מאי אהמרך (מאי חמרך) (in manuscripts, however). This responsum of Saadia is also mentioned in *Eshkol*, III, 111a: ורב סעדיה גאון גרס ד' : תמורות פירוש שדורשין כמין המעשה שנעשה דבלשון ערבי קורין המעשה חמר; and in Saadia's commentary on Berakot (edited by Solomon Aaron Wertheimer, Jerusalem, 5668, 9) on Berakot 24a the reading is also given. On the other hand, Saadia and the Aruk are quoted in Tosafot as having read פי' בערוך בשם : דורשי תמורות. Thus, in *Hullin* 134b, s. v. חמר and תמורות. ענין אחר פירש רב סעדיה גאון כמין המעשה דבלשון ארמית אומר : כמין חמר s. v. ענין

to find the characteristic method of the *Dorshe Hamurot* as shown in their interpretations, and in the etymological meaning of the word *Hamurot*. The term חמר, often used in the Talmud as a contrast to קל, means "grave," "important," "weighty," "significant," "essential." And the same meaning attaches to the terms חמר and חמורות in the phrase כמין חמר, and in the name דורשי חמורות, as some old commentators,⁴² quoted by Saadia and the Aruk, have explained. The *Dorshe Hamurot* were, therefore, those allegoristic interpreters of the law whose method and tendency were to find the importance and significance of the law, its real meaning and purpose, since it is this, the real meaning and purpose, that gives the law weight and importance, and they considered the importance and significance of the law, its חמר, to lie, not in the plain meaning of the letter of the law, but in the spirit of the law and its allegorical meaning, which they would read into it. They are distinguished from the *Dorshe Reshumot*, who interpreted the words as symbols, as signs, in that they would seek to find, in the action enjoined by the law or in the story narrated, some symbolic meaning, some idea that the law wants to impress upon us, this idea being the sole purpose of the commandment or the narrative, and giving it its significance. The historical facts in themselves as narrated in the biblical story are of no significance; they must not even be taken as true; their real meaning is the idea they suggest. The actual fulfilment of the commandment, the performance of the action it prescribes, is of little or no importance. The main thing is to

⁴² *Aruk*, s. v. חומר ומפרשין להחמיר עליו: חומר. Some commentators read *homer*, and interpret it to mean the same as the verb להחמיר "to make more important," "more weighty," and "more significant."

realize the idea expressed in it, which is its true meaning and purpose.

Herein lies the fundamental difference between the interpretations of the *Dorshe Hamurot* and the interpretations according to the rule "measure for measure," מדה כנגד מדה, or similar reasons for the laws, טעמי המצות. For the latter do not in any way affect the necessity of observing the law as commanded and prescribed. They try to give a reason why the law has ordained this or that commandment, and they also assume, that, after the law, for whatever reason, has commanded us to do this or that, we must do it. The strict observance of the law and the fulfilment of the commandment is absolutely necessary and important. The *Dorshe Hamurot*, on the contrary, do not try to give a reason why a certain commandment was enjoined. They explain to what end it was given, what purpose it serves, assuming that the end and the purpose it serves, and not the commandment in itself, is the חמר, is of weight and importance. The commandment thus becoming a mere means to an end, its actual fulfilment is not so important, if the end is reached otherwise. It can be dispensed with, if its allegorical meaning, which is its true significance, is realized by us.

Thus the tendency of the *Dorshe Hamurot* led to the neglecting, if not the abrogating, of the practical observance of the law, and it was this tendency that brought them into disfavor with the teachers of the traditional law, so that but few of their interpretations have been preserved; even these few were looked upon with suspicion, so that when they were mentioned, the rabbis felt the need of occasionally adding a special recommendation, in the words, אבל נראה, "but it seems probable (see above, p. 505).

We shall now quote all the sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, as well as those characterized as במין חמר, and see if they are all in the method and of the character peculiar to the *Dorshe Hamurot*, according to the definition given above.

b. Hullin 134b; also Sifre Deut., 165, ed. Friedmann, 106b:

דורשי חמורות⁴³ היו אומרים הזרוע כנגד היד וכן הוא אומר ויקח רמח בידו. ולחיים כנגד תפלה וכן הוא אומר ויעמד פנחם ויפלל. קיבה כמשמעה וכן הוא אומר ואת האשה אל קבתה:

The *Dorshe Hamurot* said [interpreting Deut. 18, 3], The shoulder corresponds to, or is a symbol for, the arm of a priest, as it is said of Phinehas, "and he took a javelin in his hand" (Num. 25, 7). The two cheeks correspond to, or are a symbol for, the praying of the priest, as it is said, (Ps. 106, 30), "Then stood up Phinehas and prayed" [this being their interpretation of the word ויפלל, instead of "executed judgment"]. The maw in its literal meaning of the stomach [represents the appetites], as it is said, "And the woman through her belly," (Num 25, 8). The meaning of this saying of the *Dorshe Hamurot* is not, as usually understood, that it was as a reward for the exploits of their ancestor Phinehas that the priests receive⁴⁴ these three por-

⁴³ Sifre has the reading דורשי רשומות instead of דורשי חמורות, but the latter is the correct reading. It is also given by the Yalkut. Rashi remarks here also, דורשי חמורות מקראות סתומים, those who interpret difficult passages in the Scripture, as he explains the name דורשי רשומות with whom he identifies the *Dorshe Hamurot*; see above p. 296, n. 7.—But the passage Deut. 18, 3 is in no way difficult or unclear in its meaning.

⁴⁴ For they do not say בשכר... זכה ל... which phrase would express that they deserved or received this or that as a reward for this or that; comp. Hullin 88b-99a. בשכר שאמר אברהם אבינו... זכו בניו... Here it is said היד כנגד הזרוע and the term כנגד means "corresponding to," or "reminding of," and is used to express the purpose and tendency of a law (see Bacher, *Terminologic*, I, 115).

tions of the animal as their gifts. They rather wanted to explain the חֶמֶר, significance, purpose, and meaning of the three portions assigned to the priests, which, according to their interpretation, were symbols to remind the priest of his duties, duties which his ancestor, the ideal priest, Phinehas, had fulfilled, and which rest upon every priest, for he is spiritual heir to Phinehas. The shoulder is a symbol for his arm, and is to remind him that he must use the strength of his hand in the service of God, as Phinehas did. The cheek, or jaw-bone, is to remind him that he must use his mouth and his speech in the service of God, in praying [or teaching], as Phinehas did. The maw, or the stomach, is to remind him that he must suppress and fight against lower animal desires represented by the belly, as Phinehas fought against lewdness.

The main importance of the law assigning these gifts to the priest, is that the priest should remember his duties, symbolized by these gifts. The fulfilment of the law, bidding the people give these portions to the priest, is of minor importance. The same interpretation is given by Philo in his treatise, *On the Rewards of the Priests*, ch. iv. That these three portions were given to the priest, the arm being a symbol of strength and manly vigor, the jaw-bone being a symbol of uttered speech, and that which is called paunch (an excrescence of the belly), is taken as a reminder to despise all gluttony and whatever excites the appetites. Comp. also Philo, *On Drunkenness*, ch. xvii, where he says that Phinehas did not receive any physical advantages for his great exploit, but that most important and valuable of all things, the rank of priesthood, the office of serving and paying honor to God. This proves that the interpretation of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, and Philo, alike, was not to consider these gifts to the priest simply rewards for Phinehas' action,

for the typical priest received no material reward. They are symbols of the duties of the priest, which Phinehas, the ideal priest, fulfilled in an exemplary manner.

b. Pesahim 54a:

דורשי חמורות ⁴⁵ אמרו ענה פסול היה לפיכך הביא פסולין לעולם:
The *Dorshe Hamurot* said that Anah was a bastard, and therefore he brought bastard creatures into the world.

This saying of the *Dorshe Hamurot* has been preserved in a condensed or abridged form. It presupposes a knowledge of the saying in B. B. 115b, that Zibeon became the husband of his own mother and begot Anah with her, so that the latter was born in incest. The allegorist sought to extract the real meaning and significance from the passage in Gen. 36, 24, "Anah that found the mules in the wilderness, as he fed the asses of Zibeon, his father." The *Dorshe Hamurot*, who, as we shall see, were like the Alexandrian allegorists, had the same rule as Philo (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 166), that when the literal meaning of a scriptural passage conveys but a trivial thought unworthy of the Scriptures, an allegorical meaning should be given to it. They thought it unworthy of the Scriptures to tell us of so trivial a thing as that Anah found mules in the wilderness. It can, therefore, not be taken in a simple sense. The Scripture must have yet another, a higher purpose, in telling the story, and the purpose is to teach us that evil begets evil, and uncleanness causes more uncleanness. Anah, himself born in incest, naturally brought mules into the world, bastard creatures, supposed to be born of an unnatural union

⁴⁵ Some manuscripts have חומרות instead of חמורות, and one has the reading חמורות, but the correct reading is חמורות. Here again Rashi says: דורשי חמורות מקראות סתומים, as in Hullin 134 (see note 38), but the passage, Gen. 36, 24, is very clear.

between two different kinds. This idea, that evil only comes from evil, is the חמר, the significance, and importance of the story.

b. *Soṭah* 15ab:

אמר להן ר"ג לחכמים סופרים הניחו לי ואדרשנה כמין חמר כשם שמעשיה מעשה בהמה כך קרבנה מאכל בהמה:

R. Gamaliel said to the teachers, The scribes left⁴⁶ it for me to explain [why the offering of the suspected woman, *Soṭah*, is to be of barley], in the method of the חמר, that is, like the *Dorshe Hamurot*, that, as her actions were the actions of a beast, so must her offering be of the food of beasts.

This saying is found also in *Sifre Num.* 8, ed. Friedmann, 4a, and in *Num. R.*, xiv. 39; in both places the words כמין נראה "but it is plausible," are added to the words חמר. The meaning of this saying is not that because her actions were beastlike shall her offering be of animal food. This would be according to the method of "measure for measure." And in the Talmud this interpretation of R. Gamaliel is mentioned as directly opposed to, and contrasting with, the interpretation of R. Meir,⁴⁷ which is expressly

⁴⁶ Perhaps it is to be read הניחו לי סופרים (not רנידו לי) and it means: "teachers of the law, let me [allow me to use this method rejected by you] and I will explain this law in the method of the *Homer*." This would be another proof, that this allegoristic method was objectionable to the rabbis, so that Gamaliel or Simeon b. Gamaliel had to ask leave to use it.

⁴⁷ R. Gamaliel is said to have given his interpretation after he had heard R. Meir explain, that because she [the suspected woman] had given her lover dainties, her offering should be animal food. To this explanation R. Gamaliel objected that it would only hold in case of a rich woman, but not in case of a poor woman, who could not feed her lover on dainty dishes: דשמעיה לר"מ דקאמר היא האכילתו מעדני עולם לניבך קרבנה מאכל בהמה אמר ליה התינח עשירה ענייה מאי איכא למימר אלא כשם שמעשיה מעשה בהמה כך קרבנה מאכל בהמה.

characterized as being according to the rule "measure for measure." The interpretation of R. Gamaliel is, therefore, fundamentally different from the interpretation according to the rule "measure for measure." The offering of the faithless woman is of barley, the food of animals, in order to bring it home to her, that in her conduct she was like a beast. This idea is clearly expressed by Philo, who gives the same explanation as the one described here as במין חמר. In the treatise On Special Laws Referable to the Sixth and the Seventh Commandment, ch. x, he says: "And the reason why the flour is to be made of barley is perhaps because the food which is made of barley is of a somewhat ambiguous character, and is suited to the use both of irrational animals and of needy man, and is, therefore, a sign that a woman who has committed adultery differs in no respect from the beasts, whose connections with one another are promiscuous and incessant."

The חמר, significance and real importance of this law, then, is merely to make the woman and the people realize, that adultery is the action of beasts, and, if this could be reached in another way, the actual fulfilment of the law is

We see from this passage that this R. Gamaliel was not Gamaliel II, the contemporary of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, as Hamburger (*l. c.*, 53) and, following him, Bacher, (*l. c.*, 61-63) assumed. For Gamaliel II could not have referred and objected to an interpretation by R. Meir, who lived about a hundred years later. If the reading Gamaliel here is correct, then R. Gamaliel III, the son of Judah I, is meant. Many of his sayings are found in the Mishnah, and his brother Simeon also interpreted according to the method of חמר Kiddushin 22b. But it is more probable that the reading ר"ג here is incorrect, and it should be רשב"ג, as Sifre has it. The two names ר"ג and רשב"ג were easily mistaken for each other. Thus, for instance, in Pesahim 88b, לכו ושאלו את ר"ג, where it should be רשב"ג (see *Dikduke Soferim, ad locum*); in many other places ר"ג occurs by mistake for רשב"ג. Simeon b. Gamaliel, however, was a contemporary of R. Meir, and he could well have heard and discussed R. Meir's interpretation.

superfluous and of no importance. Thus such interpretations lead to a possible neglect of the practical observance of the law, and the rabbis looked with suspicion upon them. For this reason it was necessary to add the words **אכל נראה** "although it is in the method of the **חמר**, yet this interpretation is plausible" (see above, p. 505).

Kiddushin 22b:

רבן יוחנן בן זכאי היה דורש מקרא זה כמין חמר מה נשתנה און מכל האברים שבגוף אמר הקב"ה און ששמעה קולי על הר סיני כי לי ב"י עבדים ולא עבדים לעבדים והלך זה וקנה אדון לעצמו ירצע:

R. Johanan b. Zakkai interpreted this verse [Exod. 21, 6, "And his master shall bore his ear through"] according to the method of the *homer*. Why has the ear been distinguished from all other organs of the body to be bored through? The Holy One, blessed be He, said, The ear that heard My voice on Sinai, saying, "For unto Me the children of Israel are servants" [Lev. 25, 55, which, according to the beginning of chapter 25, was spoken on Sinai], and should not be servants to other servants, and yet went and bought a master for itself, it shall be bored through.

In the Tosefta B. K. vii. 3 this saying of Johanan b. Z. is found in an enlarged and modified form.⁴⁸ There

⁴⁸ In Mekilta Mishp., ed. Weiss, 83b, there is still another form of this saying, and it refers to the slave who had been sold as such for stealing: **און ששמעה על הר סיני לא תגנוב והלך וגנב היא תרצע מכל איבריו**, The ear that heard on Sinai, "Thou shalt not steal," and yet went and stole [and had to be sold as a slave in consequence], shall be bored through. We can see from the many different forms in which this saying has been preserved, that the *Homer* interpretations, not being in favor with the rabbis, were not carefully transmitted in their original and correct form, yet the main idea of these interpretations is preserved in all the various forms of their sayings. It should also be noticed that this interpretation of R. Johanan b. Zakkai is also found in p. Kiddushin, but it is not characterized as being **חמר כמין** (see below p. 531).

it closes with the words: *וּפָרַק מִמֶּנּוּ עוֹל שָׁמַיִם וְהַמָּלִיךְ עָלָיו עוֹל*, "ב"ו אמר הכתוב תבא און ותרצע שלא שמרה מה ששמעה", "This one has thrown off the yoke of Heaven and taken upon himself the yoke of flesh and blood. Therefore says the Scripture, Let the ear be bored through, for it did not keep and observe what it heard."

This interpretation is not, as it would appear to be at first sight, a "measure for measure" explanation—because he did not heed what he heard, therefore shall his ear be bored through. The meaning is rather this, that the *חמר*, the significance and importance of this law, is merely to bring home to the slave the lesson of freedom, which he has not learned, or which he has forgotten, to remind him that he did not use the sense of hearing properly, and since he did not make the right use of this sense, he need not have it, and he deserves to be deprived of it by having, not merely the upper or lower part of his external ear bored through, as the traditional law requires (see *Kiddushin* 21*b*, and *Bekorot* 37 *ab*), but rather the tympanic membrane, so that no sound may be transmitted to him. Of course, as the whole ceremony has merely a symbolical significance, *חמר*, and its purpose is mainly to show that the slave did not listen to the word of God, it must not be actually observed, if the same idea is brought home to him by other means. Thus the practical observance of this law is of little importance, and may be neglected. Philo, in his treatise *On Cain and His Birth*, ch. xxii, gives the same interpretation of *Exod.* 21, 6. "For if the servant shall answer and say, I shall not depart and be free, he shall surely have what he asked, having first had his ear bored through, that he may not hear the words of God about freedom of soul." Although Philo explains the

whole law allegorically, as referring to the slave of passions, yet the interpretation of the act of perforating the ear is the same as that given by the *homer* method in regard to the real slave.

Ḳiddushin 22b :

ר' שמעון ברבי היה דורש את המקרא הזה כמין חמר מה נשתנו דלת ומזוזה מכל כלים שבבית אמר הקב"ה דלת ומזוזה שהיו עדים במצרים בשעה שפסחתי על המשקוף ועל שתי המזוזות ואמרתי כי לי ב"י עבדים ולא עבדים לעבדים והוצאתים מעבדות לחרות והלך זה וקנה ארון לעצמו ירצע בפניהם:

R. Simeon, the son of Rabbi (Judah I), interpreted this passage [Exod. 21, 6, "His master shall bring him to the door or unto the door-post"] according to the method of *homer*. To what purpose have the door and door-post been distinguished from all the other fixtures and furniture of the house? The Holy One, blessed be He, said, The door and the door-post were witnesses in Egypt, at the time when I passed over the lintel and the two side-posts [of the Jewish house, see Exod. 12, 23], and I said, The children of Israel shall be My servants and not servants unto servants, and I brought them forth from slavery unto freedom. Yet this one went and bought himself a master, [his ears] shall therefore be bored through in the presence of these [witnesses].

Here, again, the significance and the purpose of the law, that the slave whose ear is to be bored through be brought near the door, is declared to be symbolic, since door and door-post, having played a rôle in the deliverance of Israel and in the principles of freedom taught at that time, are well suited to be reminders to him of the lesson of freedom which he has forgotten, and to help to impress upon his mind that he was wrong in choosing to be a slave. As

the whole law has but a symbolic significance, its actual observance becomes superfluous, if the idea it is to suggest can be impressed upon the mind by other means, as, for instance, by mere words expressing these ideas. Thus the practical observance of the law may be altogether neglected.

In *Semaḥot viii*, the following four sayings are mentioned in the name of the *Dorshe Hamurot*:

דורשי חמורות אומרים: ונתצתם את מזבחותם מה חטאו עצים ואבנים
אלא לפי שבאה לאדם תקלה על ידיהם אמר הכתוב ונתצתם והרי
דברים ק"ו ומה אם עצים ואבנים שאין בהם לא זכות ולא חובה לא
טובה ולא רעה על שבאה תקלה על ידיהם לאדם אמרה תורה ונתצתם.
אדם שהוא גורם להחטיא את חבירו ומטחו מדרך חיים לדרך מות
על אחת כמה וכמה. והרגת את האשה ואת הבחמה. אם אדם חטא
בהמה מה חטאה אלא לפי שבאה לאדם רעה על ידה שלא תהא בהמה
עוברת בשוק ואומרים זו בהמה שנסקל פלוני על ידה והרי דברים ק"ו
ומה אם בהמה שאין בה לא זכות ולא חובה ולא טובה ולא רעה על
שבאה לאדם תקלה על ידה אמרה התורה תסקל האדם שהוא גורם
להחטיא את חבירו ומטחו מדרך חיים לדרך מות על אחת כמה וכמה.
וכן הוא אומר באבני המזבח לא תניף עליהם ברזל ובמקום אחר הוא
אומר כי חרבך הנפת עליה ותחללה מה נשתנה ברזל להיות פסול למזבח
מכל מיני מתכות לפי שחרב סימן קללה ומזבח סימן כפרה ומעבירין
סימן קללה בשביל דבר כפרה. והרי דברים ק"ו ומה מזבח אבנים
שאינו לא רואות ולא מדברות ולא אוכלות ולא שותות על שמטילות
שלום בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים אמרה תורה לא תניף עליהם ברזל
בני תורה שהם כפרה לעולם על אחת כמה וכמה וכן הוא אומר אבנים
שלימות תבנה את מזבח ד' אלקיך אבנים שמטילות שלום בעולם והרי
דברים ק"ו ומה אבנים שאינן לא רואות ולא שומעות ולא מדברות ולא
אוכלות ולא שותות על שמטילות שלום בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים
יהיו שלמים לפני הק"ב. בני תורה שהם כפרה לעולם על אחת כמה
וכמה יהיו שלימים לפני הקב"ה:

The *Dorshe Hamurot* said (regarding the passage Deut. 12, 3), "And ye shall overthrow their altars." How have the

wood and the stones sinned that they should be destroyed? It is merely because some mishap came to man through them that the Scripture orders them to be destroyed. Now, if the law orders that pieces of wood and stones, which can possess neither merit nor guilt, neither goodness nor evil, only because they have caused some moral harm to man, should be destroyed, then, how much more is a man to be punished who causes his fellow-man to sin, and leads him away from the path of life unto the path of death?

The same interpretation the *Dorshe Hamurot* gave to the passage in Lev. 20, 16: "Thou shalt kill the woman and the beast." If the woman has sinned, how has the beast sinned? But because some mishap came to a human being through it, etc.

Here, again, the *Dorshe Hamurot* seek to explain the חמר, significance and real purpose of the law. They reject the idea, accepted by the traditional law, that ע"ז מטמא, idols and all connected with them, are in themselves defiling, and should be destroyed, for מה חטאו עצים ואבנים, Of what offense can stones and wood be found guilty, and why should they be condemned? The purpose and significance of the law is, therefore, merely to impress the idea upon us, that everything that helps in some way to cause moral evil to man, should be destroyed, that man may not be harmed by it, that he forget the evil, not being reminded of it by its accessories, and never repeat it, and that we should learn the lesson to remove from our midst such beings as try to mislead others and cause them to sin. Of course, once we know the meaning of the law and realize its idea, it is not necessary actually to destroy the altars of the idols, for there is no defilement or uncleanness inherent in the implements of idolatry as the traditional law assumes.

The same meaning and purpose they found in the law of Lev. 20, 16, which, according to them, does not actually bid us kill the beast, but merely suggests that we should remove from our midst anything that may remind man of a moral evil, lest, being reminded of the evil, man repeat it.

The third and fourth sayings about the altar stones, which are cited here in the name of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, are mentioned, in the Tosefta B. K. vii, among the five sayings of R. Johanan b. Zakkai conceived in the method of the *homer*. כמין חמר, which we shall now quote and discuss one by one.

חמשה דברים היה רבן יוחנן בן זכאי אומר כמין חמר

The following five sayings R. Johanan b. Zakkai has uttered in the *homer* method:

מפני מה גלו ישראל לבבל יותר מכל הארצות כולן מפני שבית אברהם אביהם היה משם משלו משל למה"ד לאשה שקלקלה על בעלה להיכן משלחה לבית אביה:

1. Why was Israel exiled to Babylon, and not to any other country? Because their father Abraham's house originated in Babylon. It is as when a woman becomes faithless to her husband—he sends her back to her father's house. The significance of the exile to Babylon was to make the people realize that they committed a wrong in becoming faithless to God, that they acted like a faithless woman, and for this reason their fate has been that of a faithless woman, namely, to be sent back to her father's house.

בלוחות הראשונות הוא אומר והלוחות מעשה אלקים חמה ובשניות מעשה משה והמכתב מכתב אלקים הוא משלו משל למה"ד למלך ב"ו שקדש את האשה הוא מביא את הבלר ואת הקולמוס ואת הדיו ואת השטר ואת העדים. קלקלה היא מביאה את הכל דייה שיתן לה המלך כתב היכר יד שלו:

2. Of the first tables it is said, "And the tables were the work of God" (Exod. 32, 16), while the second tables were the work of Moses, and only the writing was God's (Exod. 34, 1). It is like a King who betroths a wife. He furnishes the scribe, the pen, the ink, the paper, and the witnesses [for the marriage contract]. But if she becomes faithless to him, and later they renew the marriage contract, she has to furnish all that is necessary for it, it is enough if the King gives his signature.—The purpose of having the second tables made by Moses was to demonstrate to the people how wrong they had been in making the golden calf, and thus becoming faithless to God, and they did not deserve that God should give them the second tables, it is enough if He writes His writing upon them. This is the significance of the passage Exod. 36, 1.

3. "And his master"....

The same as in *Ḳiddushin* 22*b*; see above, p. 516.

ואמר מזבח אבנים לא תניף עליהם ברזל וכי מה ראה הכתוב לפסול את הברזל יותר מכל מיני מתכות מפני שהחרב נעשה ממנו והחרב סימן פורענות והמזבח סימן כפרה. והלא דברים ק"ו ומה אבנים שאינן לא רואות ולא שומעות ולא מדברות על שמטילות כפרה בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים אמר הכתוב לא תניף עליהם ברזל בני תורה שהם כפרה לעולם על אחת כמה וכמה שלא ליגע בהן אחד מכל המזיקין כולן:

4. It is said (Deut. 27, 5), "Altar of stones, thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them." Why has the law forbidden the use of tools of iron and not those of any other metal? Because the sword is made of iron, and the sword is the symbol of punishment and revenge, while the altar is a symbol of forgiveness and conciliation. The symbol of punishment should be kept away from the symbol of for-

givenness. Now stones cannot see nor hear nor speak, yet because they bring about conciliation between the people of Israel and their Father in Heaven, the law forbids us to lift up an iron tool upon them. How much less should anything harmful be allowed to come to the students of the law, who bring forgiveness to the world.—The significance and the purpose of the law are to suggest to us to keep away whatever may cause injury from that which stands for reconciliation; and our ideal of forgiveness, of which the altar is a symbol, should be free from ideas of punishment and revenge. We should seek not to hurt those who bring us forgiveness. These ideas are the real meaning of the law, the actual fulfilment of the law; not to lift an iron tool upon the altar is of little or no importance, and may be neglected, if once we know what the true intent of the prohibition is.

הרי הוא אומר אבנים שלימות תבנה את מזבח ד' אלקיך אבנים שמטילות שלום. והלא דברים ק"ו ומה אם אבנים שאינן לא רואות ולא שומעות ולא מדברות על שמטילות שלום בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים אומר המקום יהיו שלמים לפני בני תורה שהן שלום בעולם על אחת כמה וכמה שיהיו שלמים לפני המקום:

5.⁴⁹ It is said, "Thou shalt build the altar of the Lord thy

⁴⁹ It is evident that 4 and 5 are two different sayings. Each interprets a different passage, containing a special law. The one (4) interprets the passage Deut. 27, 5, which forbids the use of an iron tool in building the altar, even if it be built of whole stones. The other (5) interprets the passage Deut. 27, 6, which commands that the stones of which the altar is built, be whole, not broken, and not cut by any tool, even if not of iron. These two sayings have been contracted into one (comp. Sifra Kadoshim, ed. Weiss, 92d, where they appear as but one saying). It seems that in the Tosefta they have been taken as one saying, and to fill out the number five, the saying of R. Joh. b. Zakkai interpreting the passage Lev. 4, 22, has been inserted. But this interpretation does not belong to this class, it is not in the *homer* method. The number, five, mentioned in the beginning, is completed, if we distinguish between the interpretation of Deut. 27, 5 and 6, and count them as two sayings, as, indeed, they are.

God of whole stones" (Deut. 27, 6). That means stones that bring about peace. Now stones do not see nor hear nor talk, yet, because they bring about peace and reconciliation between the people of Israel and their Father in Heaven, God wants them to be whole. As the students of the law stand for peace in the world, how much more is it necessary that they be whole and perfect before God?

The חמר, significance and purpose, of this law, is merely to symbolize the perfect agreement and harmony between Israel and God, and to suggest that those who seek to establish peace and harmony in the world must be of a whole, and perfect, and harmonious character, as the altar stones, the symbols of peace, are whole, not broken and not cut. But if once we realize the ideas which the law wants to impress upon us, it is of very little importance whether the stones of the altar be really whole or not. The important thing is not the practical observance of the law, but the understanding of what it means to teach us.

From all these sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot* and those characterized as במין חמר, we can see that the name *Dorshe Hamurot*, which, according to our definition, means "interpreters of the importance and significance of the law," was justly given to these ancient allegorists. It expresses adequately their peculiar method and tendency, to seek the important element of a law or a story and to explain its significance and purpose. This peculiar characteristic is found in every one of their sayings that have been transmitted to us, and in those sayings which are characterized as being like them, במין חמר. We have also found that they did not ascribe any real importance to the plain meaning of the law or to a story. They sought to find some idea or truth suggested or expressed in the law or the narrative of the Scripture, and this underlying idea or truth was, according

to them, the main purpose for which the law was commanded, or the story was told. They alone could give significance and importance to the law or the story.

This method did not originate in Palestine. It was not, like the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, a Jewish product, the necessary result and outgrowth of a Jewish religious principle. To the Palestinian Jew the main significance of the laws lay in the fact that they were Divine commandments, and, as such, they were important, even if they did not suggest any philosophical idea, and even if human understanding could not grasp their meaning and find their purpose. The tendency to seek some philosophical idea or truth, which, if contained in and expressed by the law, would give the latter importance and significance, originated among the Alexandrian Jews, who were influenced by Greek thought. And the method they employed in reading philosophical ideas into the law, was also an imitation of the Greek method of interpretation. As the Greek sought, by means of allegoristic interpretations, to find all wisdom in Homer, so the Greek Jews sought to find all wisdom contained or indicated in their law, and their method was an allegoristic interpretation, which made the laws and narratives of the Scriptures express or suggest some recondite ideas and philosophical truths (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, p. 25).

In the *Dorshe Hamurot*, therefore, we recognize the Alexandrian⁵⁰ allegorists or some of their Palestinian fol-

⁵⁰ The origin of the Hellenic allegorist method, which served as a model to the Alexandrian allegorists, was the interpretation of the narratives and myths of Homer (comp. Siegfried, *l. c.*, 16). If, therefore, the reading *המור* instead of *המור* has any foundation, and is not merely a misprint for *המור*, then it would designate the method of the Alexandrian allegorists by referring it to its origin and to the model they followed. The phrase *כמיין המור* would, therefore, mean simply: Interpret the Scripture as if it were Homer, or in the same way as Homer is interpreted. But we have found that the correct reading is *המור*.

lowers. Accordingly, it appears that the two ancient classes or schools of allegorists, the Alexandrian and the Palestinian, are both mentioned in the talmudic-midrashic literature, the former under the name *Dorshe Hamurot*, the latter under the name *Dorshe Reshumot*. We have seen that to the sayings of the *Dorshe Reshumot*, as well as those of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, there are parallels in the interpretations of Philo, which is not at all strange, since Philo was influenced by both the Palestinian and the Alexandrian allegoristic methods (see above, p. 328, and Schürer, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III,⁴ p. 701 ff.), and his rules were a combination of the rules of Palestinian teachers and the hermeneutic rules of the Stoic philosophers (comp. Siegfried, 165). From the fact that the Alexandrian allegoristic method, חמר, and they that used it, דורשי חמורות, are mentioned in the Talmud and the Midrashim, we can see that just as the Jewish or Palestinian method found its way to Alexandria, and was applied by Philo, so the Hellenic or Alexandrian method found its way to the Palestinian schools, and was occasionally, though only reluctantly, applied by the Palestinian teachers of the law. The latter method, however, carried with it grave dangers for Judaism, for, as we have seen, it tends to make the actual fulfilment of the law and the practical observance of religious ceremonies superfluous and unnecessary, since the purpose of the laws and commandments is merely to suggest ideas and teach philosophical truths. Even in Alexandria, where it originated, some objected to it, seeing in it a danger to Judaism (comp. Philo, *De somnis*, I, 16-17). The danger was real, for some Jews did, indeed, draw the feared conclusion from the allegoristic interpretations of the law, and went to the extreme of neglecting altogether the practical observance of Jewish religious laws and ceremonies. And they con-

tented themselves with the understanding of the ideas suggested or expressed by these laws or ceremonies (comp. Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*, 16). In Palestine, where this method was a foreign product, the objections to it were much stronger. We have seen (above p. 329 ff.), that because of its abuse, the Palestinian teachers objected even to their own allegoristic method, the method of רשומות. But their opposition to the Alexandrian method, which was not of Jewish origin, was much stronger, especially when the Christians made use of it to show the irrelevance of the practical observance of the law. We find some utterances of the teachers of the traditional law that express the strongest condemnation of the manner in which some people habitually use this allegoristic method in their interpretation of the Scripture. Thus the "slandorous interpretations," הנדרות של דופי, ascribed to Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah, which the rabbis condemn (in Sanhedrin 99b, and Sifre Num. 112, ed. Friedman, 33a), were such allegoristic interpretations, given by some heretic of their own times, whom they considered on a level with the wicked King Manasseh. The interpretations themselves are not given to us; the rabbis apparently did not care even to repeat them. For it is evident that the questions:

וכי לא היה לו למשה לכתוב אלא ואחות לוטן תמנע. ותמנע היתה
פלגש לאליפז וילך ראובן בימי קציר חטים וימצא דודאים בשדה:

do not constitute interpretations, הנדרות. These questions are merely introductory remarks to interpretations given to the passages, Gen. 30, 14; 36, 22. 12. showing how absurd it would be to take these passages in their simple, literal meaning, to think that Moses did not have anything better to write in the Torah than such trivial stories. These stories are, therefore, not to be taken literally; they

are to be interpreted in an allegorical way, to demonstrate that they contain some higher ideas, which make them worthy of having been written by Moses in the law, as the *Dorshe Hamurot* invested the story of Anah and the mules with a recondite truth, for the reason that the literal meaning of the story is too trivial to have been recorded in the law unless it conveyed another meaning. Such interpretations the rabbis considered slanderous, since they imply that the stories of the Scriptures, in their literal meanings, are not true and not worthy of being told and recorded. In Sifre, *l. c.*, these interpretations are repudiated with the remark: כסבור אתה שמא כדרכי :בשר ודם דרכי המקום: , You think the Divine ways are like human ways. You assume to judge the Divine law by your human standards, and dare judge what is or what is not worthy of having been recorded in God's law.

Another protest against the allegoristic interpretations in the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot* is contained in the following passage of the Mishnah Berakot (v. 3):

האומר על קן צפור יגיעו רחמיך משתקין אותו:

Whoever says, "To the birds' nest extend Thy mercy," is to be silenced. The exact meaning of this Mishnah passage was not known to the Amoraim; they merely tried to guess at it. But the various explanations given by them are not satisfactory. In the Palestinian Talmud two explanations are given, one by R. Phinehas is that it sounds like a complaint against God, as if one were to say: Thy mercies reach to the birds' nest, but to man they do not reach, for Thou allowest man to suffer:

בקורא תגר על מדותיו של הקב"ה על קן צפור הגיעו רחמיך ועל אותו האיש לא הגיעו:

The other explanation, by R. Simeon, is, that it sounds

as if the Divine mercy were limited to the birds' nest alone:

כנותן קיצבה למדותיו של הקב"ה עד קן צפור הגיעו רחמיו:

In b. Berakot 33, two other explanations are given:

חד אמר מפני שמטיל קנאה במעשה בראשית וחד אמר מפני שעושה
מדותיו של הקב"ה רחמים ואינן אלא גזירות:

One says, It is forbidden because in saying so, we create jealousy among the created beings, as if God had mercy only upon the birds, and not upon His other creatures. The other says, Such a saying as the Mishnah forbids, declares the rules and laws of God as mercy or love, while they are decrees. The fact is that the Mishnah did not mean to forbid a man to appeal in his prayers to the Divine mercy, by referring to the law of Deut. 22, 6, as an expression of His love for His creatures, and there is no harm in seeing in the laws of God merely expressions of love. And when a rabbi once uttered the prayer: "Thou hast shown mercy to the birds' nest, show Thy mercy and Thy compassion to us also": אתה חסד על קן צפור, he gained the admiration of Rabbah, who expressed himself thus: כמה ידע האי מרבנן לרצויי למאריה, "How well this rabbi knows how to plead with his Master." These words were said in all sincerity, not merely to sharpen Abaye's wits (לחדורי לאביי) and to rouse his protest against this prayer, as explained in Talmud Berakot 33a. The Mishnah here refers to the people who deny that God meant us to fulfil the law of Deut. 22, 6, in declaring it to be beneath God to extend His mercies to such insignificant creatures as birds in a nest. We can find similar interpretations by Philo and by Paul. Philo (*De somnis*, I, 16) explains the law in Exod. 22, 26, in an allegorical way. He says, It cannot mean a real

garment, as God would not concern himself about a garment, and would not think of prescribing a law for it. And Paul, in I Corinthians 9, 9-10, in explaining the law (in Deut. 25, 4), says: It is written in the law of Moses, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." Doth God take care of the oxen? or doth He say it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written.

He therefore explains the law to mean that the teachers of religion be supported and provided for, for it would be unworthy of God to concern himself with oxen and take care of them. To such allegoristic interpretations of the law the Mishnah refers in the saying *האומר על קן צפור יניעו רחמיו?* Whosoever says: "Do God's mercies extend to the birds' nest? Can God concern Himself with such trivial things?" is to be silenced. We should not listen to such interpretations of the law, which deny the necessity of fulfilling it and observing it practically.

This resentment against the allegoristic method grew greater in Palestine, where there were frequent disputes with the Jewish Christians, who used such allegoristic interpretations of the Scripture in their arguments for the superiority of their new religion. The later Palestinian teachers rejected its use, and tried to suppress it. They could not reject the method of the *Dorshe Reshumot* altogether, since the latter was a purely Jewish product. They therefore merely restricted its use, but the Alexandrian method, the method of the *Dorshe Hamurot*, being a foreign product, could be rejected wholly. This explains the fact that in the Palestinian Talmud not one saying of the *Dorshe Hamurot* is mentioned; not even those sayings characterized as *במין חמר* are found in the Palestinian Talmud, with the ex-

ception of the saying of R. Johanan B. Zakkai (Kid-dushin 22*b*) which, however, is mentioned in the parallel passage in the Palestinian Talmud, without being characterized as במין חמר (see above, note 48). In Babylonia, however, where they had no religious disputes with Jewish Christians, and, therefore, did not have occasion so often to note the dangerous side of the allegoristic method, they did not object so strongly to the allegorists, not even to the *Dorshe Hamurot*. It is due to this fact that the few sayings of the *Dorshe Hamurot* and those belonging in the same category with them, במין חמר, have been preserved to posterity.

THE SUPPRESSED PARTS OF A SHABU'OT

PIYUT

BY A. MISHCON, London

"EVERYTHING—so goes the Zoharic saying—depends on good luck, even the Sepher-Torah in the ark." Yea, we may add, even the *piyut* in the Maḥzor. There are two *piyuṭim* by Rabbi Simeon ben Isaac the Great (x—xi century) based on one and the same theme. Both were soon allotted prominent places in the קרובות שבועות: the one headed ה' קנני on the first day, and the other, commencing שעשוע יום יום, on the second day of the festival. Considerable parts of each of these *piyuṭim* were regarded objectionable and were banned by some over-zealous scribes. Yet how different was the fate of the one to that of the other. No sooner did the printer take the place of the copyist, than the second *piyut* was restored to its original form. It has thus been published ever since in the Ashkenazic Maḥzor, in the latest English edition¹ of which it has been admirably rendered into English verse. But the parts deleted from the other poem have to this day not gained re-admission to the Maḥzor. Heidenheim was apparently the first who undertook to give them publication and, with that object, included them among others in a

¹ מח' עבודת אהל מועד, ed. by A. Davis and others.

separate pamphlet entitled **מבוא המהזור**². But the pamphlet has never seen the light.

It is thus for the first time that those lines, written some nine hundred years ago, are here being published.

The subject treated in these two *piyutim* is the Torah. We are told that long ere Moses appeared on the scene, the Heavenly Father was anxious for this beloved daughter of His to choose a spouse from among the sons of the earth, through whom she might be introduced to the children of men. Adam, Noah, and the patriarchs were thus mentioned as probable suitors, but the celestial maiden points out grave defects which put each of them beneath her dignity. It is the lines in which the faults of our progenitors are enumerated that were considered offensive and were accordingly suppressed.

That the *piyutim* were not altogether eliminated from the Maḥzor is undoubtedly due to the great respect commanded by their author, who was celebrated as a scholar and famous as a benefactor of his people.³ Even those who denounced the poetical writings of Ibn Gabirol and Ibn Ezra because "the rays of wisdom (= mysticism) did not illumine them,"⁴ could not fail to regard his poetry as "having been written in the proper (= mystic) manner."⁵ For not only was our author a Kalirian to his finger-tips, but he was also a mystic of no mean order.⁶

The writer has only come across one Maḥzor (Romagna rite) where the **ה' קנני** is replaced by another

² See note in his Maḥzor, ed. 1805, IV, 94.

³ Graetz (Eng. Edition), III, 252.

⁴ **ספר חמדת הימים**, p. 29.

⁵ **או"ח**, מג"א, § 69.

⁶ **ר' שמעון הגדול שהיה מלומד בנסים**, ed. Venice, 6a: **שבלי הלקט**.

piyut. In all other Maḥzorim examined the objectionable passages only are omitted and in the two or three where they are wholly or partly retained, they are left unvocalized. Since, as mentioned above, the other poem is printed completely in our Maḥzor, only the suppressed parts of the one just named are presented here as selected from some fourteenth century MSS. in the British Museum. They are given under the headings of the respective paragraphs which they supplement.

About him (Adam) did the Torah reply to the Only One: When he was one, Thou didst say, "It is not good that man should be alone," and didst give him a help-mate. Yet even with her he transgressed three of Thy commands: "Thou shalt not steal"—by sharing that which was stolen; "Thou shalt not bear false witness"—for he and his wife gave false evidence; "Thou shalt not covet"—for they both coveted and ate the forbidden fruit. He shall therefore not be crowned with glory.

עמר אדם — —

עליו השיבה תורה לאחד

בעת היה אחד הונעם יחד

וכשנשלף ממנו צלע אחד

שליש דברות הפר יחד

הפר לא תגנב וחלק עם גנב כאחד

הפר לא תענה והעיד עם אישתו

עדות שקר יחד

הפר לא תחמד ויאכל ויחד

ובחופת כבוד לא לו יום אחד

She retorted as to him (Noah):—If he be just and perfect so that he dealt

פריש זה — —

פצה דת כתובה עליו להשיבה

with every animal in the ark according to Thy wish, wherefore was he so heedless on coming forth? He drank to excess and was drunken. He who resisted all the waters of the flood, did not resist the tempting drop! In the sight of his sons he lay naked and disgraced.

Then the Torah exclaimed about the beloved one (Abraham) that he is well known to her as the Lord was known to him. He lacked understanding and questioned: "Wherefore shall I know?" He was then answered: "Thou wilt surely know." He thus suffered his descendants to be enslaved without knowing for how long.

Of the only son (Isaac) did the law break forth in poetry: True he was found perfect and fit for a sacrifice. He gave himself up willingly to the

אם צדיק הוא ותמים בנתיבה
וזהיר במצוה עם כל נפש בתבה
למה לא נזהר בצאתו מן התבה
וישת וישכר ולמאוד רוח
הסבל במי המבול לא סבל
טפת תאוה
ויתגל בתוך השכיבה ובא לידי חובה
ונתבזה בעיני ניניו בערוה

צ"ן ממזרח — —
צוחה אמון בדבר מודע
כי כמו הודע כן נודע
וכמו שמך ידע כן נתודע
איך טולטל ממדע להבין ולידע
ופץ בלי מדע במה אדע
והקשיב על דבריו ידע תדע
וגרם לניניו קץ מלדע

קרבן שלם — —
קול נתנה דת על יחיד בחירה
אמנם נמצא שלם כזבח תורה

knife, the altar, and to be bound, and he was saved from sword and fire. Yet, in his old age he called the one whom Thou didst despise. "Take thy weapons," he said to him and thus permitted him the use of them for ever after; "thy quiver and thy bow"—and thus gave him dominion; "and go out to the field"—and conferred kingdom upon him. It was the virtuous woman that ordered the perfect one to prepare venison for his father, who—when he was scarce gone and his brother came back from hunting—exclaimed, "Who then is he?" and wanted to curse him who dwelt in the tents of learning. But for the voice that came from above, he said: "He, too, shall be blessed."

His (Jacob's) sons did evil in selling their brother to Egypt because of the

והיטלים נפשו למאכלת למוֹבֶחַ
ולעֶקְדָה

ונִישֵׁעַ מִחֶרֶב וּמִמְקָדָה

אֶךְ לַעֵת זָקְנָה וּלְיוֹם פְּקוּדָה

קָרָא לְשׁוֹנֵאֵךְ בַּחֲמַד חֲמַדָּה

שֶׁאֵין כָּלִיד זִיָּין אוֹתוֹ יַעֲרָה

תְּלִיד וְקִישְׁתְּךָ שֶׁלֹּטוֹן לוֹ הָאֲחִידָה

וְצֵא הִיטְדָה מְלוֹכָה אוֹתוֹ הַסְעִידָה

לִלְוִי קִדְמָה אִשָּׁה חֲמוּדָה

וְצוֹתָהּ לָתֵם בַּתְעוּדָה

וְיִלֵּךְ וְיִקַּח וְיָבֵא וְיַעֲשֶׂה סְעוּדָה

וְיִהְיֶה אֶךְ יֵצֵא יֵצֵא וְאֲחִיו בֵּא מְצִידָה

וְגַם מִי אֲפֹא וְחָרַד חֲרָדָה

וּבִקִּישׁ לְקַלֵּל יוֹשֵׁב אֶהְלִי תַעוּדָה

לִלְוִי בֵּת קוֹל מִמְרוֹם יִרְדָּה

וְגַם גַּם בְּרוּךְ יִהְיֶה בַּתוֹךְ קֹהֶל וְעֵדָה

רוּחַק אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל — —

רַע גָּמְלוּ לָדֶם לְמַכּוֹר מְכוּרָה

⁷ The word is evidently לָחֶם, see Ps. 78, 51, etc.

distinguished coat that he made him. Also because of the dreams that he dreamed they hated him exceedingly. On being asked to recognize that coat he was overwhelmed with grief. "He is surely rent," cried he bitterly. The holy spirit had departed from him because of his misery, and he said in his wrath: "My way is hid from the Lord."

על דברת כתונת המנוכרה
ועל חלומות אשר חלם שנאוהו
שנאה חמורה
בנאם הכר נא נפש זקן עברה
ואנחה עליו גברה
טרף טרף צעק צעקה גדולה ומרה
ורוח הקדש מפני אבלו סרה
ופץ בכעס וגם בעברה לומר אמירה
מאת ה' דרכי נסתרה

A commentator asserts that the two *piyutim* under consideration are versified renderings of a Midrash which contained the entire legend. The writer's painstaking search has failed to trace such Midrash. The following passage, however, in *מדרש חזית*, I, 24, is a very close approach: "When Israel stood at Sinai, God said unto them, I will give you My Law on condition that you will bring sureties who should warrant its observance. Said they, Our Patriarchs will pledge for us. Whereupon He said, I have aught to say in their disfavor: Abraham doubted My word and asked, 'Whereby shall I know?'; Isaac preferred Esau whom I disliked; Jacob said, 'My way is hid from the Lord.'"

OESTERLEY'S "THE PSALMS IN THE JEWISH CHURCH"

The Psalms in the Jewish Church. By W. O. OESTERLEY. London:

SKEFFINGTON & SONS, 1910. pp. 267.

MR. Oesterley belongs to that class of English scholars who, while conservative adherents of the Christian Church, approach Jewish subjects with commendable fairness and sympathy and endeavor to do justice to the Jewish view voiced by Jewish authorities. His writings, therefore, are always welcomed with a certain gratification by the Jewish student, however he may differ in particulars. The work before us, written in simple style for the average reader interested in Biblical subjects, deals chiefly with the liturgical use of the Psalms in both the Temple and the Synagogue. Whether the name Jewish Church for both of these which Stanley and others brought into use in England is correct or well-chosen is not for discussion here. The author certainly knows how to elucidate his subject and render it interesting. The first two chapters are devoted to Hebrew music in general. While making good use of what has been written on Jewish Music from old Ugolino down to Benzinger, the author throws new light on its characteristic features and its relationship to that of primitive tribes and of the Oriental nations and the more refined one of the classical nations, particularly the Greek. On the whole he follows Benzinger in maintaining that the ancient Hebrew music came quite near the Bedouin and modern Egyptian music about which Lane gives interesting detail, which music, while lacking harmony and little pleasing to our ear, is yet not without peculiar charm and power. But he also thinks that ancient Egypt influenced the pre-exilic, and Babylonia the post-exilic, period, whereas the more refined Greek music left certain imprints upon the last Temple period. In al-

luding, however, to the fact mentioned by Herodotus that "the song of *Maneros* sung in Egypt was identical with the song of *Linos* heard alike in Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Greece, as it went by a different name in each race," he failed to realize the importance of this information for the tracing of the history and origin of all liturgical music. For both the *Linos* song—a corruption of the *Oi lanu*, "Woe to us!" sung at the *Adonis* rite spread all over the ancient world—and the *Maneros* song—from Marna "our lord" another name for *Adoni*—became the keynote for the religious and folk-songs of Egypt and Babylonia, Syria and Phœnicia, Phrygia and Greece. And in all likelihood the Greek *elegos* (song of mourning) was also originally the Semitic song of wailing—*eli* and *elut*, while the Canaanite vintage cry *hedad*, so often mentioned in the Scriptures, had also its origin in the cry *hoi dod* ("Alas, O friend!") uttered over the dead *Adonis*-*Tammuz*. Hence the singular fact that the whole Semitic music with its prevalence of the *minor* key echoes, exactly as does the Hebrew song, the *kinah* melody (comp. Kohler, "The Psalms in the Liturgy" in *Publications of the Gratz College*, 1897, 182 f.).

The third chapter treats of the Musical Instruments used in the Temple, which are divided into Percussion, Wind, and String Instruments. The author, however, fails to indicate to which of the four periods of music named at the close of the preceding chapter the use of these instruments may with some degree of certainty be ascribed, nor does he state that most of the headings of the Psalms, which refer to these musical instruments, point to the time of the author of the Book of Chronicles whose terminology offers the key to the musical terms found in the various Psalm headings. In regard to the Maccabean period the author might have mentioned that the terms *kitharis* and *pesanterin* in Daniel indicate that these instruments were imported from Greece over Syria. Altogether he pays too little attention to the results of historical and critical Bible research and he leaves us in the dark where we want light. It is rather surprising that he did not consult Franz Delitzsch's most valuable commentary on the Psalms. He would have found that already Delitzsch took the words *al alamot* as signifying "After the

manner of maidens," in the sense of soprano voices, although Mr. Oesterley adduces on p. 56-59 comp. 116 many new instances in favor of this explanation (comp. Köhler, *l. c.*, 183). He might have used also to great advantage the numerous historical notices, culled by Delitzsch in his Introduction, from the Talmud.

Another valuable source of information escaped the notice of our author in not having become acquainted with Prof. Graetz's Commentary on the Psalms, the best and most instructive part of which is the rich historical material and critical analysis of the Psalms given in the Introduction. In many instances Mr. Oesterley would have changed or modified his views regarding the musical terms and instruments or the character of the Psalms, had he availed himself of Graetz's studies on Psalmody during the second Temple period. Graetz rejects—and the writer of this thinks quite correctly—the view taken by mediæval and modern exegetes that in headings such as *al tashhet*, *ayyelet ha-shahar*, or *yonat elim rehokim* we have the titles of ancient popular songs and instead he finds in them merely clerical corruptions of terms denoting musical instruments.

In Chapter IV which deals with "The Antecedents of the Psalms" our author refers especially to Robertson Smith as authority for the statement that the folk-songs gave the musical tunes to the sacred songs of the liturgy; the question is, whether the Levite guilds of the Temple would ever have dared to select well-known secular tunes for their sacred songs. Aside from that, it is unlikely that the tune of a vintage-song known as *al tashhet* ("Destroy it not!") should have been chosen four times for the Psalms 57, 58, 59, and 75, whereas a comparison of the heading of Psalm 9 *al mut labben* and the last words of Psalm 48 *al mut* plainly show that these musical annotations on the margin of the various Psalms had become illegible or unintelligible for the copyists. The classification of the types of songs which preceded the composition of the Psalter is according to our author (p. 64-76) the following: 1. Songs of praise either of the Deity or of the heroic ancestor; 2. Songs in memory of great events; 3. Harvest and vintage songs; 4. Meditations or Individual Prayers. This classification can scarcely

be called a good one, as the first and second class are really identical, clustering as they do around some memorial or festival day.

In speaking of the Constituent Elements of the Psalter in Ch. V (p. 78-95), Oesterley dwells at some length, without however fully elucidating the subject, on the most important point in the study of the Psalter, that is, the composite character of many of the Psalms, and the original type as well as the date of the other Psalms. It almost seems as if the ultra-conservatism of our author embarrasses him whenever he is forced to concede a point in the critical analysis of the Psalter. Rabbinical tradition knows only of 147 Psalms, and it is a mistake on the part of the author (p. 79) to refer to Kiddushin 30a for a different opinion. Strange that Samuel should be mentioned as collector and editor of the Psalms—due to a mistaken remark of the unreliable Hamburger (*Real-Encyclopaedie*). Owing to a strange remark of Briggs in his Commentary on the Psalms p. LXVIII, that the *Ani* ("the afflicted one") in the heading of Psalm 102 is a pseudonym, the author mentions *Oni* alongside of Asaph, the Korahites, Moses, Solomon, Heman, and Ethan as writers of Psalms (p. 80).

In principle Mr. Oesterley is right when he says (81 ff.) that the Psalms underwent changes when put to liturgical use; some which belonged together, forming one Psalm, such as Ps. 9 and 10, or 42 and 43, were separated, while others, which were originally different Psalms, were combined into one. Comp. Ps. 108 with 57, 8-12 and 60, 7-14; or 40, 13-17 with Ps. 70; 31, 1-13 with 71, 1-3; and 115, 4-18 with 134, 15-31. He might have mentioned also Ps. 19, 1-6 and 7-15, or Ps. 24, 1-6 and 7-10 as composite Psalms (comp. Kohler, *l. c.*, 187 f.)

It is rather surprising that the author has but a few words to say about individual psalms (p. 93 and p. 174) which forms one of the most important questions regarding the character and origin of most of the Psalm, viz., whether the Ego of the Psalms was at the outset to be the Israelitish community—which opinion is to-day held by the majority of Commentators,—or whether the Ego was originally that of the individual composer who voiced his own feelings of anguish, or thanksgiving, in the song, and only when trans-

formed into a liturgical hymn, the Psalm voiced the feelings and experiences of the religious community (see Köhler, *l. c.*). A closer examination of the various Psalms in the older collections, or the first three books, shows that many have undergone a process of transformation from individual outpourings to Congregational or Temple songs. That the headings stating the occasion on which certain Psalms were written by David are of a late origin and altogether without foundation in fact or in the text, our author obviously hesitates to say.

What is said in Ch. VI on the Poetical Structure of the Psalms may suffice for the average student but takes little cognizance of what recent writers have contributed to this interesting subject. When speaking of the Acrostic Poems (p. 198) he might have referred also to Lamentations and at the same time pointed out the fact that, like Ps. 9 and 10, Ps. 25 and 37 have been tampered with, whether owing to clerical errors or to intentional alterations it is rather difficult to say.

Ch. VII which treats of the Psalms in the Temple Worship, begins with the correct observation that the statement often made that the Psalter was the Hymn-book of the Second Temple is not strictly accurate, "for it is reasonably certain that it contains a good many Psalms which were not, and were never intended to be, sung at public worship."

While the author in his lack of critical acumen is inclined to believe in the Davidic authorship of the Psalms, taking the description of the Temple worship given in the Book of Chronicles not as a reflection of the cult of the Second Temple but as an actual historical fact, he at the same time relies on the information derived from Talmudic sources which refers exclusively to the second Temple period, and, we may add, to the post-Herodian period. Frequently the selection of Psalms for the week-days or the sabbath and festival days was made without regard to their contents and inner relation to the day.

While speaking in Ch. VIII on the Psalms in the Ancient Synagogue worship, Mr. Oesterley never considered the possibility of a large number of the Psalms having originated in such circles as

would regard prayer and song the only proper form of worship and therefore make the Synagogue their rallying place instead of the Temple with its sacrificial cult. The fact is that the *Hasidim*, the predecessors of the Pharisees and Essenes, were the authors of many of the Psalms; hence the anti-sacrificial spirit voiced in some, such as Ps. 40 and others. The remark of Mr. Oesterley that the Synagogue was primarily a place for the study of, and instruction in, the Law (p. 132) is altogether erroneous. Nor is it true that "the earliest elements of synagogal worship were developed from the Temple service." The Temple service is a compromise between the priestly and the ancient Hasidean form of worship (see Kohler, "Ursprünge und Grundformen der Synagogalen Liturgie" in *MGWJ.*, 1893, 441-451; 489-497; comp. also Kohler, "The Psalms in the Liturgy," p. 193 ff.). Ch. IX treating of the Psalms in the Modern Synagogue contains interesting material for the average reader with especial reference to the Sefardic and Ashkenazic rituals. The same useful eclecticism of our author is shown also in Ch. X in which the Psalms in Private Use are spoken of. Obviously the article on Psalmomancy, "the magic use of the Psalms," in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, X, 240, directed his attention to the *Sefer Shimmush Tehillim* of which he gives extracts, as if this superstitious practice was characteristic of the Jewish Church and not equally indulged in by the Syrian and the mediæval Christian world of Europe, as Blau in the article quoted and the art. "Bibliomancy" in the *JE.* show. How much Mr. Oesterley is fascinated by this sort of mystic lore is shown by the fact that he devotes a whole chapter to Psalm 91 called by the rabbis "The song of Evil Encounters," but his conservatism induces him so to interpret the Psalm as if its author wanted to counteract the belief in incantation and the fear of demons by referring the worshipper to *Shaddai*, "the Most High," in contrast to the *Shedim*. It can hardly be said, however, that Mr. Oesterley was very felicitous in his interpretation. As a matter of fact, the Psalm is an Incantation Psalm to be recited by different persons, and it was ascribed to Moses (see Num. r., 12, 3). The XI Chapt. on Jewish Exegesis of the Psalms is of value to Christian readers only. That the "artificial" enumerations in the Midrash on Ps. 1 of twenty Beatitudes (*Ashre*) to cor-

respond with the twenty Woes in the book of Isaiah has its exact parallel in Luke 6, 21-26 and Matthew 5, 3 ff.; 23, 13 ff., Mr. Oesterley failed to see, and so he might in many other instances have found the New Testament exegesis influenced by the Jewish Midrash.

Hebrew Union College

K. KOHLER

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS DEALING WITH THE BIBLE

The Temple Dictionary of the Bible. Written and edited by Rev. W. EWING, M.A., and Rev. J. E. H. THOMPSON, D.D. London: J. M. DENT SONS, LTD. (New York: E. P. DUTTON Co.), 1910. pp. lix + 1012.

THE volume which is neatly printed and profusely illustrated will meet the wants of those classes for whom it is intended: "the working clergyman, the local preacher, the class leader, the Sunday School teacher, and the ordinary reader of the Bible." It is popular in style and compact in its contents. The articles present useful summaries; the purely technical is as much as possible eliminated. The bibliographical references are serviceable, though not copious; where a popular treatment of a subject is available it is naturally given precedence; nevertheless, the references are up-to-date. The Dictionary is divided into a Canonical and an Apocryphal section; the former is preceded by special articles dealing with the English Bible, and its influence on English literature; the Apocrypha of the New Testament; Apocalyptic Literature; the Targums; the Versions of the Scriptures; Philo Judæus; Josephus Flavius; the language of Palestine during the time of Jesus; an introductory article on the Apocrypha of the Old Testament precedes the latter section. Eight maps are appended to the volume. The attitude of the editors and contributors (among whom we notice Dalman, Mrs. Gibson, D. S. Margoliouth, Orr, Robertson, Sayce) to the "higher criticism" is a conservative and cautious one; while acknowledging the fulness of information which criticism has laid bare, they shrink back from following its conclusions of the more advanced

type and express a mild doubt as to the cogency of the argument from internal evidence. On the other hand, the Dictionary embodies the latest results of research along the lines of history, geography, and archæology. The editors are certainly in the right when they assert that "there is a place for a Dictionary of the Bible which, leaving aside all that is merely theoretical and speculative, shall present simply and clearly the state of ascertained knowledge on the subjects dealt with, at a price [\$4] which shall bring the latest results of scholarly investigation within the reach of every earnest student of the Bible."

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D. New edition, revised (1910) and printed from new plates. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. xxv + xi + 577.

Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Von Dr. E. SELLIN. Leipzig: QUELLE & MEYER, 1910. pp. xv + 153.

Old Testament History and Literature. By B. H. ALFORD, London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., 1910. pp. xix + 318.

The Story of the Bible from the standpoint of modern scholarship. By WALTER L. SHELDON. Second edition. Philadelphia: S. BURNS WESTON, 1909. pp. 187.

The last edition of Prof. Driver's "Introduction" appeared in 1898 practically in the form in which it had been published in the previous year when the entire work was re-set. For the new edition which thus appears after an interval of twelve years re-setting was deemed unnecessary, the alterations and additions being introduced on the stereotyped plates. Most of these changes affect the bibliographical notices which have been brought up to date, while references to older books which have been superseded by fresher publications have been excised. So far as the matter of the work is concerned, the most important modifications and additions are found in the criticism of Isaiah and Jeremiah where the more recent analytical work of Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti is duly recorded, without, however, receiving the author's support; then the

linguistic matter proceeding from the Assuan and Elephantine finds is estimated in its bearing on the date of Daniel and Ezra-Nehe-miah, the net result being that while there are many points of contact between Egyptian Aramaic and the Aramaic of the Scriptures the former is more archaic. It, therefore, becomes impossible, on the ground of language, to vindicate for the literary productions in question a higher date than the one warranted by internal evidence. Thus it will be seen that the newest "Driver" has remained much the same; for practically the bulk of the work has been left unaltered. The vagaries of the "advanced school" are rejected; there is a chariness in subscribing to the views of those who find in the prophetic books but meager kernels belonging to the pre-exilic seers, all else being post-exilic frame-work; nor is meter accepted as an all-sufficient guide to distinguish the genuine from the spurious after the fashion of Duhm and his followers. In the historical works, but notably in the *Hexateuch*, Prof. Driver has changed his position of twelve years ago in practically no point at all. Yet, where the bibliography at least has been made inclusive of most recent works, it is to be regretted that not only are some notable contributions overlooked, but especially that the author has not deemed fit to modify his opinions somewhat or at least to indicate his reasons for adhering to views so recently challenged. But this may be said in passing on to the other work where just those deficiencies are made good that Driver's work is concerned mainly with problems of literary criticism, whereas the historical criticism does not fall within its scope. It is true that Driver is not blind to the fact that a literary document may be late and yet incorporate a knowledge of institutions much older than itself; but that is not quite what we mean now by investigations into the history of literature as contrasted with mere literary criticism. For it is the merit of Gunkel and his school to have emphasized the point that even the oldest source that has entered into the make-up of a document has a long history behind it and that there is a long road from the earliest record of a legend to the period in which that legend was first composed, orally perchance. "Literarkritik" on the whole deals with literary compositions of larger dimensions, the first Jahvist, or the first Elohist, for example; "Literaturgeschichte" is concerned in that just as

well, but in much more: it would trace even those works to their sources, and these sources will naturally be oral in the end, but they may have constituted by themselves literary documents long before they were embodied in the great documents out of which our historical works in the Scriptures have been constructed. And the same holds good of the legal documents: not merely the institutions of which even the latest speaks may be old—that is granted by Driver—but even a literary record of them must have existed long before the documents were composed that are now extant. Another impetus came from the same school of Gunkel (we need only think of his own *"Schöpfung und Chaos"* and Gressmann's notable work on the origins of Judæo-Israelitish eschatology) and consisted in the placing of the cultural history of Israel within the larger frame-work of the cultural history of Western Asia: the net result has been an understanding of the futility of determining the date of a thought or opinion merely on the basis of where we first meet with it in the extant literature of Israel. It is impossible to enter here into the manifold ramifications of this subject; suffice it to say that while it has been abused by many, in the hands of sober scholars it necessarily becomes a formidable weapon with which to combat the excrescences of the older school of criticism. While both the latest edition of Driver's book and the smaller and less pretentious work by Sellin were printed in the same year (1910), it is the latter that is really up-to-date not merely on the bibliographical side, but principally because of its adjustment to the newer principles. We feel on every page and in every paragraph an element of newness which is refreshing. The author takes us into the very fray of conflicting opinions, but he always knows how to impart his own view, candid, sober, just. In Pentateuchal criticism he is greatly under the influence of Klostermann; but Eerdmans has been equally consulted, though not yet Wiener. The Pentateuch is composite; its component elements are the four well known "documents"; yet, in their sources, these documents ascend in part at least to high antiquity. Thus there are imbedded in the Pentateuch literary records of the pre-Mosaic (Gen. 14; 9, 25-27; 4, 23 f.) and Mosaic (Exod. 15, 21; 17, 16; 20, 1-17 the Decalogue! Num. 6, 24-26; 10, 35 f.; 21, 14 f.; 21, 17 f.; 21, 27-29; Exod. 20, 23-23, 19 the

Book of the Covenant!) period; from the period of the Judges proceed Exod. 15, 1-18; Gen. 49 in substance; Deut. 33; Exod. 34, 10-27; Deut. 27, 15-26; Gen. 48, 22 and much else; from the era of David Gen. 49, 8-12; Num. 23 and 24; from the time of Solomon the redaction of the Jahvist (from Gen. 2 to I Kings 2) and the first edition of the Elohist (from Gen. 15 to Josh. 24); Deut. 32 is placed about 850 and the second edition of the Elohist (from Gen. 15 to II Kings 3) about 800; to the period of Hezekiah belongs the combination of the Jahvist with the Elohist and the kernel of Deuteronomy; in 622 occurred the finding (to be taken literally) of Deuteronomy which was soon amplified, thus receiving in particular the historical introduction 1, 1-4, 4, and then worked into the Elohist; in the Exile the great deuteronomic history (from Gen. 2 to II Kings 25) arose by combination with JE; about 500 the Priests' Code was composed in Babylon, the sources of which, notably the Law of Holiness (Levit. 17-26), but also other parts, ascend into the times of Manasseh; Ezra's Book of the Law of Moses comprised our Pentateuch. Such is a meager outline of Sellin's view concerning the genesis of the Torah. But a similar conservatism coupled with modernity may be observed in his treatment of other problems outside the Pentateuch and the historical books. The Messianic passages are left to the pre-exilic prophets, in agreement with Gressmann. Deutero-Isaiah intended his own work to be ascribed to the older prophet to whose prophecies the Babylonian seer appended his own. While Maccabæan Psalms are not ruled out of court, Davidic hymns are pointed out, and the bulk of the Psalter is derived from pre-exilic times. In two brief appendixes the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, including the latest find of the Odes of Solomon, are described. The small volume deals also with the constitution of the text and the canon. Though written with a view to serving the needs of "wider circles," it will prove an excellent guide even to more searching students. I have come across a few errors (so e. g. the Samaritan Pentateuch is included among the versions, and among the latter the Vulgate is missing).—Alford's book, on the other hand, is strictly popular; it endeavors to present the literary history deductively in the frame-work of a general history of the Jews, much after the fashion of Reuss. The author will hardly lay claim to origin-

ality; but he has used the critical literature to good advantage; a learner himself, he is naturally committed to the views of a school which, in the light of my previous remarks, must be accounted as out of date. While the masters are busy revising their opinions in the light of the latest and freshest research, the scholars will naturally lag behind.—What has been said of Alford, is to still a larger extent true of Sheldon's "Story of the Bible," a posthumous second edition.

History of Old Testament Criticism. By ARCHIBALD DUFF, D.D., LL.D. With illustrations. New York and London: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1910. pp. xiii + 201.

The New Bible-Country. By THOMAS FRANKLIN DAY. New York: THOMAS Y. CROWELL & Co. (1910). pp. 32.

What Cheyne set himself to do in 1893 in his "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," a book full of information but somewhat marred by a polemic against the more timid among English critics, is now attempted in a smaller compass and in more popular form by Prof. Duff. The author who inscribes his work to the memory of his teacher Lagarde is largely under the influence of Duhm. His treatment of the history of criticism follows in main the beaten track after the fashion of the corresponding chapters in Holzinger's "Introduction to the Pentateuch" or Reuss' presentation of the subject in the introduction to his French (and German) translation of the Hexateuch, at least for the part dealing with Hexateuchal criticism. He is unconventional and novel in describing the period during which the documents which enter into the composition of the Pentateuch arose as one of criticism; the point of view being that as the Elohist sought to place his work in the room of the Jahvist, he exercised his critical faculty, just as the amplifiers and editors of the Jahvist before him had freely criticised that literary document, and just as the Deuteronomist freely handled the work of both Jahvist and Elohist. Similar freedom obtained later on in handling the text of the Pentateuch, as is evidenced by a comparison of the received text with that underlying the versions. This, of course, is Geiger's point of view, though the Jewish critic of the nineteenth century

is nowhere mentioned. Prof. Duff fails to take cognizance of Gunkel and Eerdmans. Otherwise he is well informed. The little work will serve its purpose well enough; as such it deserves the place which has been assigned to it in the "History of the Sciences." The volume is illustrated with portraits of sixteen leaders in the criticism of the Old Testament; that of Lagarde adorns the frontispiece. I doubt whether Lagarde would have relished the company; the greater number of his illustrious contemporaries he knew himself at war with; his strength lay in the main in fields other than the "higher criticism." The "New Bible-Country" of which Prof. Day speaks in his booklet representing an address delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, San Rafael, California, is the new view of the Bible maintained by criticism. Those that are satisfied with the old pre-critical views are admonished to leave criticism well enough alone; those, on the other hand, who feel the difficulties of the old traditions need not fear the results of the newer view so far as their love for the Scriptures is concerned. The critics, it is true, hold that many of the books of the Old Testament are composite; that the biblical writers sometimes incorporated mythical and legendary materials; that here and there they idealized the past; that many of the books of the Old Testament have undergone revision at the hands of later editors; that the Hebrews were indifferent to the fame of authorship, thus late works coming to be ascribed to famed men of an earlier day. But then the Bible is not a cyclopædia of information, nor a text-book of science or history. It is rather a divine-human record of God's revelation in progressive steps with the prophetic element predominating therein. "Prophecy prepares the way for Christ, not by uttering verbal predictions of His coming (for the prophets nowhere predict the details of His earthly life), but by doing its own work in its own day so grandly that Jesus when He came found a godly remnant, trained in the school of prophecy, ready to receive Him." Prof. Day apparently limited himself to Old Testament criticism and its bearing upon the Christian beliefs. Had he included in his "New Bible-country" the territory of New Testament criticism, let us say of the type of Schmiedel's radical position to which Duff expressly adverts, it may be reasonably doubted whether the alarms felt by his audi-

ence and by the Christian community at large would be so easily allayed. It must be owned that even New Testament critics of the most advanced class know themselves at one with the substantial doctrines of Christianity; but would an orthodox Christian rest satisfied with that residuum?

Alttestamentliche Studien. Von B. D. EERDMANS. I. Die Komposition der Genesis. pp. viii + 95. II. Die Vorgeschichte Israels. pp. 58. III. Das Buch Exodus. pp. 147. Giessen: Verlag von ALFRED TOEPELMANN, 1908-1910.

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B. Oberlin: BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, 1909. pp. xiv + 239.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B. Oberlin: BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, 1910. pp. v + 152.

Das Deuteronomium. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung. Von Dr. A. FILEMON PUUKKO. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. ix + 303.

As is well known, the starting-point of the Pentateuchal analysis was Astruc's discovery (in 1753) of the divine names in Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus as a clue to the documents or "mémoires," as he called them, which entered into the composition of the Pentateuch. The attack on this basic theory and the gigantic edifice that has since been reared upon it comes from two quarters which though they have much in common on the side of method are different in their preconceptions and results; both, however, illustrate that regress to "first principles" by which questions seemingly disposed of are reopened, constituting as it does criticism's safest corrective when in forgetfulness of its own origin it shows itself ready to relapse into dogmatism. Prof. Eerdmans was a pupil of Kuenen's and is now the occupant of the chair formerly held by the intrepid Leiden critic. Up till recently he found himself in accord with the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school. Now, however, he has at length

emancipated himself, and in the three parts of his "*Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*" so far issued, after demolishing the current "documentary hypothesis" which according to his judgment is based principally on the erroneous theory of Astruc, proceeds to develop his own views. According to Eerdmans, Astruc's discovery has operated in throwing the critics off the scent. The divine names are far from being the mark of disparate compilation. The trouble is that the Old Testament students have quite as much as the scribes of old read monotheism into the texts of antiquity. Elohim means "the gods" in the plural, no more and no less. Where the term occurs, we are confronted by polytheistic notions. Naturally passages in which the polytheistic ideas are discernible even under their present cloak which is none too heavy must of necessity be archaic. They cannot possibly have been composed in post-exilic times. One need only think of the first chapter of Genesis (comp. verse 26). Moreover, the followers of Astruc are constrained to pin their faith to the received Hebrew text; but in no less than 49 places in the book of Genesis does the Septuagint differ from the masoretic text in the reading of the divine names. This is an appeal to the "lower," or textual, criticism. Similarly uncertain is the current argument from vocabulary or phraseology. The remains of the Old Hebrew literature are too scanty to serve as a safe basis for such fine linguistic discriminations. Recent archæological finds are calculated rather to prove the high antiquity of texts usually placed in latest times. Thus "the field of Abram" (comp. Gen. 23) occurs as a place-name in an Egyptian list of the tenth century (Breasted, Spiegelberg). A most frequent handle for detecting different "hands" is the lack of coherence in contiguous parts. Criticism thus reveals itself as an offshoot of interpretation. But the scalpel of criticism may be used too freely, too readily; and a difficulty of interpretation may be removed by ordinary exegetical processes. Thus in 16, 1-3 much depends upon the correct interpretation of שָׁמַע לְקוֹל at the end of verse 2—hence a purely lexical question. When the phrase is correctly interpreted, verse 3 ceases to be a mere repetition. Incidentally Eerdmans shows how a provision in the Code of Hammurabi throws much light on the episode in question. Ehrlich (*Randglossen I, ad locum*) equally finds the chronological notice

in verse 3 far from superfluous. Criticism operates too freely with supposed doublets. What may appear redundant at the first blush will in the light of fuller information prove a necessary part of the context which cannot be removed therefrom without destroying the sense. Elsewhere a supposed redundancy (*"Überfüllung"*) may be due to scribal carelessness (dittography). Suffice it to say that all along the line the "higher" criticism must go hand in hand with the "lower" and the other subsidiary operations of philological interpretation. To this extent Eerdmans' anticritique comes as a timely warning against the too facile methods of removing exegetical difficulties by cutting the Gordian knot. It is frequently the easiest way out of the difficulty. But Eerdmans follows up his negative destruction of the current analysis by one of his own. The groundwork of Genesis consists in a "Book of Adam" or "Jacob rescension" of a polytheistic character which was compiled out of still older sources before 700 (5, 1-32; 6, 9-22; 7, 6-9. 17-22. 24; 8, 1-19; 9, 8-29; 11, 10-26. 27-32; 12; 13, 1-13. 18; 15, 7-12. 17-21; 23; 25, 7-11. 19-34; 27; 28, 11-22; 32, 4-23; 33, 1-17; 35, 1-8. 16-20. 23-29; 36, 1-14; 37, 2. 25-27. 28b. 34. 35; 40; 41; 42; 45, 1-27; 46, 2b-7; 47, 6-12. 28; 49, 1a. 29-33; 50, 12. 13). As may be readily seen, much of what is currently reckoned to post-exilic P is assigned by Eerdmans to this ancient pre-exilic source. The fact that a chronological system runs through it is no argument to the contrary. "We have grown into the habit of looking upon anything of a systematic character as necessarily late... We should grievously err in conceiving the pre-exilic times as a period devoid of the higher civilization. The legislation contained in the Book of the Covenant sets us right on that score. The chancellor at the court and the frequently mentioned "scribes" (soferim) suffice to prove the existence of a class of learned men. To this class we naturally owe the transmission of the ancient traditions. There is no reason why these pre-exilic sofrim should have not possessed historical knowledge quite as much as the post-exilic sofrim." Polytheistic notions, according to Eerdmans, underlie many of the elements that entered into that source. The compiler apparently was of the opinion that the God of Israel was but one among many. Into the groundwork was subsequently, but still in pre-deuteronomic

times, worked another recension, the Israel recension, which ran parallel to the older source in contents and in spirit. Herein Eerdmans reverts to the "supplement theory": the supplementer took over from the parallel source just enough to round off the historical picture. The work thus amplified then underwent in post-deuteronomic times a revision from a monotheistic point of view. The process of revision went on for a considerable time thereafter; hence the post-exilic additions, some larger (like chapter 17), some smaller (glosses). Gen. 1-2, 3 may and may not be older than chapter 17; on the other hand, Gen. 14 (with minor exceptions) is of pre-exilic origin. The bulk of the legends in the book of Genesis originated among the masses; the common people accepted the monotheism of Deuteronomy with a strong admixture of polytheistic notions. Even post-exilic Jewry believed in a multitude of spirits by the side of the One God. "Should we not reasonably expect traces of a polydæmonistic religion in the pre-exilic tradition?" The reader will now perceive that, with Eerdmans as a guide, the current critical analysis with three well-defined documents makes way for a series of revisions of an ancient groundwork, and that in the measure as the greater part of the book of Genesis, including notably such passages as have hitherto been pronounced to be of exilic or post-exilic origin, gains in the point of antiquity, it loses on its religious side, being reduced to the low level of pre-deuteronomic polytheism. Jewish monotheism dates from the time of Josiah and Jeremiah; among the masses it is of still later date. But the literary composition of the bulk of the book of Genesis ascends into the eighth century or even farther up. The fine polish of literary style obtained already then, albeit even with the cultured classes the Lord was but one among many!

If we have lost in Genesis an ancient record of monotheism, if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob cease to be proclaimers of the One God, are they at least historical personages? and are the accounts of the beginnings of the people of Israel contained in the book of Genesis to be given credence? For in the school of the literary critics there has hitherto prevailed an attitude of skepticism on those very points. The exegetical method applied by the critics of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school has been clearly the alle-

gorical one; not to be sure of the Philonian kind, but allegorical nevertheless. The patriarchs have been pronounced to represent humanized deities (B. Luther, Ed. Meyer); or the patriarchal legends are said to have been originally myths which were then translated into their present form (Stucken, Winckler, Erbt, Völter, Jensen), or to be reflexes of Israelitish life and customs during the period of the monarchy (Wellhausen, Stade, and others). To these opinions as currently held by the one or the other Eerdmans opposes his own view which comes pretty near substantiating the historical character of the patriarchs. Not that every detail of the patriarchal story can be verified: the legends of Genesis, being folk-products, must be traced back to a variety of motives and origins. But the historicity of Abraham is established beyond doubt from the mention of "the field of Abram" in an Egyptian list of the tenth century (see above). And what is of equal importance the main fact that the ancestors of Israel dwelt in Canaan previous to the people's migration to Egypt equally receives confirmation at the hands of Egyptian monuments. We know from the stele of Meneptah (discovered in 1896) that about 1230 B. C. Israel dwelt in Palestine. Moreover, while the other places and lands mentioned there receive the determinative indicative of a country, there is prefixed to Israel a man and a woman with plural strokes; that is to say, Israel does not denote a territory, but a tribe. It appears also to be spoken of as an agricultural population. Eerdmans sees in all this a reference to the conditions exactly as they are depicted in Genesis: a small body of semi-nomadic folk held together by tribal ties but without a country of their own, though they own land. These conclusions make it necessary for Eerdmans to place the exodus at a somewhat later period than is currently assumed, about 1130 B. C. He identifies the 'Apiru of whom mention is made in the monuments of the intervening century with the Hebrews, and rejects the theory which looks for the Hebrews in the Habiri of the Amarna tablets. The patriarchs were not nomads (Wellhausen), but semi-nomads (Ed. Meyer): they owned cattle but also land. There is no truth in the current distinction between a nomadic and an agricultural period in the life of Israel nor in the customary deduction that the prophetic religion is the resultant of a

clash between the Dionysiac civilization of the monarchy and the simple Bedouin traditions of antiquity. If the patriarchs tilled the soil, then the Israelites were from the start an agricultural people.

The effect of these deductions on the dating of the legal portions of the book of Exodus is obvious. On the assumption of the purely nomadic civilization of Early Israel, no place could be found for such a code of laws as the Book of the Covenant before the times of the monarchy. It is characteristic that in a footnote to the 1905 edition of his "Prolegomena" (p. 392) Wellhausen gives expression to his conviction that the "peasant code" of Exod. 21 and 22 is in its basis Canaanitic, i. e. pre-Israelitish. He pointedly adds: "The Laws of Hammurabi are better edited, but are just as little manufactured as those of Exod. 21 f.; they may equally be very ancient. It does not, however, follow from the fact that they are ascribed to Hammurabi that they were really promulgated by him. In view of our experiences elsewhere this conclusion of the Assyriologists is not quite cogent. It may be said a priori that the reverse is more probable." Eerdmans goes further; he sees no reason why the Book of the Covenant could not come from Mosaic times. Nor is he averse to placing the Decalogue in the same period; but it is a Decalogue much abbreviated and much shorn of the hallowed associations which both Jews and Christians connect with it. To be ancient, the Decalogue must not be positively monotheistic. The First Commandment is rendered not "I am the Lord thy God," but "I, Jahveh, am thy God." The Second Commandment merely proscribes the adoration of the images of other gods in the sanctuary of Jahveh; "before Me" is taken most literally. Incidentally the current conception of the prophets as originators of "ethical monotheism" is controverted. An ethical conception of the Deity existed in much earlier times (even among non-Israelites). Otherwise the Book of the Covenant remains unexplainable. As for the rest of the book of Exodus, suffice it to mention that, according to Eerdmans, Exod. 12 is in the main pre-deuteronomic; a pre-exilic kernel is also assumed in the chapters dealing with the description of the tabernacle (25-29; 35-39) which are currently assigned as a whole to P.

A reader with conservative leanings will naturally turn away from Eerdmans' three volumes with much shrugging of the shoulder and feel safer with the two publications by Mr. Wiener, a barrister-at-law in London. Like Eerdmans, Wiener operates with the "lower," or textual, criticism versus the "higher," or literary, species. It speaks well for the seriousness with which he has approached his task that he has not shirked the labor of acquainting himself at first hand with the literature bearing upon the correctness of the received text. He has consulted Kennicott and De Rossi; Field's Hexapla and Lagarde's Lucian; the larger Cambridge Septuagint and the latest article on the grouping of the codices in Genesis by Dahse. He gives tabulated lists of variants for the divine names in Genesis. He endeavors to show that in following up Astruc's clue scholars have adhered too closely to the received text. He is ready to concede that the latter must occasionally be given up and that better readings are preserved in manuscripts not commonly accepted as trustworthy or in the versions. He believes that the same recourse to the Greek version and especially to certain recensions thereof which is had in the Books of Samuel for example should be had likewise in the Pentateuch. It may be safely presumed that Wiener's insistence on constructing a better Hebrew text will not be challenged by critics, nor for that matter his canons of textual criticism so far as they are general in character. But Wiener, I believe, underestimates a possibility with which criticism has to reckon: the ancient translators may have introduced conscious changes for the sake of removing difficulties of contradiction or incongruity. Harmonistic manipulation of the text in the original or in translation precedes the harmonistic exegesis of which examples abound in the talmudic-midrashic literature and in the mediæval Jewish commentaries. *Lectio ardua praestat*. A difficult reading is always to be preferred to an easy one. Like all canons of criticism, this one likewise must by no means be applied through thick and thin, but should be taken with a grain of salt. Wiener applies textual criticism also to other difficulties not proceeding from the diversity of the divine names with notable success. But the crucial problem is that of the divine names, and I am free to say that

neither a self-sufficient leaning on the received text nor an unreasonable measure of skepticism is in place. A monograph on the divine names in the Pentateuch would be timely. It will involve a grouping of the Greek codices which is no easy task.

Wiener meets the critics on their own ground. He applies the textual method where it will serve his purposes. He does not shirk delving in archæological and anthropological lore. His reading is extensive. It includes for instance Norden's *Kunstprosa*. He cites a passage which the writer of this review has long recognized as having a bearing on the question of biblical style. The difficulties arising from the laws with regard to place of sacrifice or to the personnel of the temple he solves by theories which are certainly ingenious. He distinguishes between customary lay-sacrifices, national offerings, and statutory individual offerings. He pleads after the manner of Hoffmann that P does not square with the post-exilic practice. The net result of his anticritique is the concession that there is post-Mosaic material in the Pentateuch; but at the same time he establishes the presence of pre-Mosaic material. The text needs re-constructing; but the bulk fits the Mosaic period, and that only. He rehabilitates Ezekiel: the prophet reverted to the Mosaic tradition because it fitted the circumstances of his time. The presence of a sanctuary in Elephantine proves to him the antiquity of the Mosaic legislation: Moses framed a law for Palestine; when the exile came and the synagogue as a substitute for the temple worship had not yet been evolved, each section of Jewry was free to adjust the law to the changed conditions as best it might. It is interesting that Wiener's conclusions come pretty close to the decisions of the Pentateuch commission appointed by Pope Leo XIII (see *Osservatore Romano*, 1906, No. 164). The Pope likewise concedes post-Mosaic glosses and textual modifications, just as he also assumes pre-Mosaic material. The papal commission grants that Moses may have dictated the contents of the Torah and that thus the incongruities in language and style may have arisen. We lay aside Wiener's publications of which "The Origin of the Pentateuch" is the more popular and which are being followed up by a series of articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* with this feeling: The Pentateuchal question will bear reopening. The critical position

has become the orthodox one; but neither orthodoxy nor fashion is a measure of scientific achievement. Where the issues are so momentous, cool and unimpassioned judgment is exceeding difficult. But undignified expressions are as much out of place with the traditionalists as they are with the critics. The tone adopted by Wiener is not always a pleasing one. But few will read his studies without learning something from this intrepid champion of tradition who uses many untraditional weapons; not the least lesson being that criticism can ill afford to rest on foundations which cannot stand a fresh test with regard to their solidity. And the test has been instituted by Wiener and Eerdmans. On the negative side, they meet; on the positive, they are as far apart as Hoffmann and Wellhausen have ever been.

Puukko's volume moves along the tracks of the literary criticism current in the dominant school. He establishes the historicity of the account of the finding of the Law (II Kings 22) against the hypercritics (Havet, Vernes, Horst, Day, Cullen). No other of the extant codes will answer the description of the Josianic Torah than Deuteronomy. But Deuteronomy itself is composite. In unraveling the process of composition—what the author considers as the "Urdeuteronomium" he prints at the end in translation—he combats a variety of theories that have been propounded by others, not the least important being that of Klostermann who by means of a somewhat far-fetched analogy from Icelandic law finds the essential part of the Moabitic code in the hortatory framework by which it is enclosed no less than in the parenetic comments which accompany the laws themselves: the Deuteronomic code ascending in substance to Mosaic times was the type of all legal instruction which it was customary for the functionaries of law to give generation after generation in the form of elucidation and exhortation, in short, after the manner of an oration such as is the great oration of Moses which constitutes the bulk of Deuteronomy. Puukko adopts a theory evolved by two previous writers on the subject (Staerk and Steuernagel) to the effect that the "singularic" portions constitute the original of the Deuteronomic Code as promulgated in the eighteenth year of king Josiah.

Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Studien zur Sacharjaprophetie und zur jüdischen Geschichte im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert. Von Dr. J. W. ROTHSTEIN. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. ii + 219.

Die Bücher Esra (A und B) und Nehemja, textkritisch und historisch-kritisch untersucht. Mit Erklärung der einschlägigen Prophetenstellen und einem Anhang über hebräische Eigennamen. Von G. JAHN. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1909. pp. xci + 289.

Ezra Studies. By CHARLES C. TORREY. Chicago: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1910. pp. xv + 346.

Geschichtliche und literarkritische Fragen in Esra 1-6. Inaugural-Dissertation von Johannes Theis. Münster i. Westf., 1910. pp. vii + 60.

Next to the Pentateuchal question, and indeed playing into it, the critical and historical questions connected with the literary documents of the early post-exilic period have given rise in the last fifteen years to a number of special investigations; the appearance of four works devoted to the same circle of related problems or to some specific problem within that circle shows how far the subject keeps engrossing the attention of scholars and how much debated ground there still exists. In close sequence upon a previous publication on Haggai entitled "Juden und Samaritaner" (1908), Rothstein seeks to penetrate into the meaning of the seven nocturnal visions of the prophet Zechariah. After clearing the text of glosses and corruptions by a process of subjective conjecture, the author arrives at the conclusion that all the visions came to the prophet in one night, the night or rather the dawn of the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month in the second year of Darius. Convinced as the author rightly is that the immediate occasion of a prophetic utterance must be found in the occurrences of the day and that its primary object is the message it bears to the seer's contemporaries with their actual present-day needs and problems, he draws the lines backward and forward as he finds them in the literary productions at both ends with the result that they converge to form a picture of the events external and internal

to which an adjustment on the part of the new community was imperative. How far the picture when completed really squares with the facts may still be a matter of doubt. But then the facts are so scanty that a gauge is scarcely available, unless it be that of inner probability; and the impression produced by Rothstein's reasoning is that his conclusions are by no means improbable. The two months which followed upon the message of Haggai ending with the outlook into a purified community and with words of encouragement to Zerubbabel were sufficient to produce in the heart of the new community the selfsame pusillanimity and despair which had taken hold of them before Haggai arose. New intrigues on the part of the enemies of Judah manifested themselves; and altogether the community was perplexed by a variety of problems which required meeting. To them Zechariah addressed himself. He saw the vision of the dawn of a better day; he was assured of the Lord's great plans for the welfare of the community then and later. Statesmanlike he counseled the abandoning of the project to build the walls of Jerusalem. That was dangerous then; the time had not yet come for that, though it did come later. There was an element in the community that operated with the Messianic expectations such as had been aroused by Deutero-Isaiah and thought the moment opportune for carrying them to fruition. Not so the prophet. For the prophet, let it be remembered again, must see into the needs of his day; nothing was farther from the Jewish prophets than a fixed scheme of salvation applicable to all times. With reference to the farther and farthest outlook they were all of one mind; they differed, and had to differ naturally, when the questions uppermost for the moment had to be answered. Things may be expedient, that is realizable, and therefore politic, at one time and not at another. The salvation of the new community demanded that the extravagant political notions of the Messianists should be deferred. With the keen eye of the seer, Zechariah realized that only on the basis of Ezekiel's programme could the constitution of the new community be effectively constructed. And that programme was practical, because it was adjusted to the immediate conditions. Thus the Messianic king had to be placed in the background or at least subordinated to the highpriest. But the priesthood required

purification. "Joshua was clothed with filthy garments." The admixture with the populace had involved the priestly families. The purified sons of Zadok were to constitute the leaders of a purified community, much though the degraded Levites, the former priests at the highplaces, intrigued against them. Rothstein endeavors to show that not only in this central thought does Ezekiel's influence show itself in the visions of Zechariah, but likewise in some of the less important points. Zechariah thus becomes an important link in the development of ideas between Ezekiel and Ezra with his Priests' Code; when the new community was constituted, it became apparent to its spiritual leaders that the Deuteronomic Code required much modification in the spirit and along the lines of Ezekiel if it were to become operative. Once Ezekiel's programme had become actual in its most important points at least, the way was paved for the activities of Ezra and Nehemiah some seventy-five years later.

Unorthodox as all this may seem to some readers, it is eminently orthodox compared with the radicalism of Torrey and Jahn. It is interesting that the two Ezra critics are Arabists of high standing. Jahn has of late years turned his attention to Old Testament studies; his principles of textual construction have, I believe, not commended themselves to scholars no less brilliant, but perhaps a trifle more staid. Torrey's first effort in Ezranic criticism dates from the year 1894. The pamphlet entitled "The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah" was, as we are told by the author in the preface to his "Ezra Studies," a volume made up of papers that have appeared elsewhere (with exception of the last chapter which is entirely new), not sufficiently taken notice of by scholars; the reason for the neglect, he thinks, lay in the circumstance that so novel a position as his was was presented in too succinct a manner and that much that required fuller treatment had been disposed of by the way, in short, had been taken for granted. Jahn (who acknowledges his indebtedness to Torrey's earliest publication) and Torrey, though disagreeing on a number of points, so for instance on the original language of the Aramaic portions, are of one mind in their principal contentions. Jahn formulates his theses, no less than eighteen, in the large Introduction the bulk of which is devoted

to a spirited repudiation of the opinions of other scholars who though more or less at variance with each other stand on the opposite side in this important debate; while thus the argumentation in the Introduction is more of a negative character, the positive proofs for his startling theories are developed in the book proper which takes on the form of a running commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah. (Incidentally Jahn tries to prove that the forms of the proper names in the Septuagint reveal the presence of many heathen deities thus establishing the persistence of polytheism down to post-exilic times.) Torrey, on the other hand, proceeds in a more systematic manner; in a series of chapters he builds up his argument into which a variety of questions enter, textual, linguistic, literary, historical; it is moreover, presented with consummate philological skill and erudition; when thus the destructive work is done, he winds up with a chapter which he regards as constructive, wherein his positive opinions as to the origin of the books in question and the history of the times from 722 to the end of the second century B. C. are set forth with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired. In substance the novel theories of Torrey (with whom, as has been noted, Jahn is in the main at one) amount to no less than this: The so-called apocryphal I Esdras contains the genuine Septuagint translation of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, albeit in a fragmentary form. The underlying Semitic original (half-Hebrew, half-Aramaic) constituted one of the recensions of the Chronicler's work; it contained the interpolated Story of the Three Youths composed in Aramaic (according to Jahn, in Hebrew). The Chronicler incorporated in his work the "Words of Nehemiah" (the greater part of the first six chapters of Nehemiah) and an Aramaic Story of Samaritan Intrigues (Ezra 4, 8-6, 14). While the former was an ancient document which may be accepted as historically trustworthy, the latter was a late fabrication nearly contemporaneous with the Chronicler, its purpose being to present the history of the post-exilic Jewish community in such a manner as to show that its antecedents were to be found in the exiled Babylonian community rather than in the native population of Palestine that remained on the soil after 586. The point of the story was directed against the Samaritans who, it was represented,

were from the beginning rejected by the children of the Golah. The Chronicler had before him the Pentateuch, but the Priests' Code was compiled long after Nehemiah. The final redaction of the Pentateuch must have preceded the Samaritan schism; hence the date of the latter event is placed just a trifle ahead of the advent of Alexander the Great. Previous to that time Jews and Samaritans lived in tolerably amicable relations. The importance of the Babylonian exile has been exaggerated. "Pre-exilic" and "post-exilic" are misleading terms. Not the exile, but the Dispersion was the all-important event in the history of Israel. The dispersion began at an early period, and was to a great extent voluntary. The Babylonian exiles made themselves at home in their new environment; they became citizens of their adopted country and contributed to its building up in the capacity of traders and financiers. They neither longed for a return nor did they occupy their leisure-time with literary productions. The Book of Ezekiel is an apocryphon composed about B. C. in Palestine; Deutero-Isaiah at an earlier time wrote in Palestine; the Priests' Code was compiled in Palestine. Jewish legalism and narrowness dates from the beginning of the Hellenistic period; the early post-exilic community was far more tolerant and universalistic-prophetic. There was no return under Cyrus; the edict is a fabrication. Ezra is a fictitious personality. Long before Nehemiah, Jerusalem had been rebuilt by the remnants of the native population, those that had not emigrated. The temple was rebuilt under Darius I in the times of Haggai and Zechariah (according to Jahn, in the days of Nehemiah). Nehemiah found the city in a weak position; he rebuilt the walls. All these extremely novel and startling theories are presented with a degree of certainty which fairly takes one's breath away. I doubt nevertheless whether Torrey will have more success with his latest publication than was accorded him in 1894. The sweeping distrust of tradition condemns itself. There is too much falsification to be assumed lightly. It must, however, be granted that Torrey deserves to be heard before he is brushed aside. His work contains a number of points which must be well weighed. His investigations betray a solid amount of painstaking study. I call particular attention to his discussion of the Theodotionic origin of the so-called

II Esdras. His grouping of the Greek codices seems to be borne out by the facts. His sallies against the indiscriminate, dilettantic use of the Septuagint will merit approval. He is conscious of the difficulties that beset the path of retroversion from the Greek, far more conscious than Jahn. The latter is much too facile with his construction of Hebrew sentences. Contrast the retranslation of a portion of I Esdras as done by both men. Torrey has studied the style of the Chronicler to great advantage. What he has to say on the biblical Aramaic as compared with Egyptian will on the whole approve itself, though, I fear, he does not take sufficiently into account the orthographic peculiarities of the later scribes. The Assuan and Elephantine papyri are originals; the biblical texts have been copied again and again. It is quite conceivable that if we had access to the autographs of the Aramaic portions of Ezra, their orthography would be much the same as that of the Egyptian documents. The pronunciation of the dentals in Aramaic must have fluctuated for some time, probably for centuries; both the earlier and the later orthography failed to square with the actual pronunciation; where the one erred on the side of archaism, the other was faulty on the side of modernism. Scholars that have no particular theories to defend may still maintain with good conscience that to all intents and purposes the Palestinian and Egyptian Aramaic come very close to one another.

It is interesting to add that in Theis' dissertation which contains but a part of a larger work to appear in the series "*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*" edited by Prof. Nikel (himself the author of a publication dealing with the vexed problems centering in Ezra-Nehemiah) Torrey's theories concerning the character of I and II Esdras which in the main are also those of Sir Henry Howorth are accepted in full. It will be instructive to see how far they will be turned by the Catholic author to conservative uses.

Aegypten und die Bibel. Die Urgeschichte Israels im Licht der ägyptischen Mythologie. Von Dr. DANIEL VOELTER. Neubearbeitete Auflage. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1909. pp. viii + 135.

Israel und Aegypten. Die politischen Beziehungen der Könige von Israel und Juda zu den Pharaonen. Nach den Quellen unter-

sucht von Lic. theol. ALBRECHT ALT. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICH'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1909. pp. 104.

Die Bedeutung des Namen Israel. Eine quellen-kritische Untersuchung. Von Lic. theol. EDUARD SACHSSE. Bonn: CARL GEORGI, 1910. pp. iv + 79.

Völter's work, first published in 1898 and now appearing in its fourth edition, is built up on the theory that the heroes of Israel, the patriarchs and Moses, are humanized deities; in contrast with the Pan-Babylonists, he looks for the originals in Egyptian mythology. See above the reference to Eerdmans' criticism. It is assumed by Völter that when Israel entered Palestine, it found a civilization largely permeated with Egyptian influences which increased through the subsequent centuries during which Israel remained in close contact with Egypt. To the political relations between the two nations Alt devotes a well-written monograph. He begins with Sheshonk (Shishak) and winds up with Necho. The study is preceded by an enumeration of the sources. The story as developed by the author reveals the sad plight of the two kingdoms between the treacherous Egyptian power which was the instigator of all the foolhardy attempts at shaking off the Eastern yoke through trust in the "broken reed" of Egypt and the overtowering strength and political statecraft of the powers in the East. In consolation the writer demonstrates how that very conflict served to bring out the prophetic certainty which runs through the writings of the great seers from Hosea to Jeremiah and Ezekiel that "the kingdom of God on earth should not be built on the tottering foundations of politics, but solely on the unshakable ground of faith." Sachsse's study of the meaning of the name "Israel" is published only in part. Its main conclusion is that Israel as the name of the patriarch is more recent than as the designation of the collective body of the people or of the state.

The Early Religion of Israel. By LEWIS BAYLES PATON, Ph.D., D.D. Boston and New York: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, 1910. pp. 115.

Israel's Ideal, or Studies in Old Testament Theology. By Rev. JOHN ADAMS, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARKE, 1909. pp. xi + 232.

The early religion of Israel means to Paton the pre-prophetic stage. The prophets, in particular those of the eighth century and their followers, were the reformers of the religion of Israel. Israel's religion had its origin in Semitic polydæmonism based on animistic conceptions. Jahveh was unknown to the patriarchs. He was originally a non-Israelitish deity with volcanic associations. Moses adopted him. When Israel entered Canaan, it found an indigenous religion which was polytheistic. Just as the historical people of Israel represents a "hybrid mass" into which the Canaanitic elements were absorbed, so did Jahveh gradually absorb the nature gods and departmental deities of the Canaanites whose various functions he assumed. Many of the heathenish conceptions of the Canaanites clung to Jahveh. He demanded right conduct, but "the rules of conduct applied only to relations with fellow-Israelites." "Of such virtues as modesty, temperance, and other forms of self-restraint the early Israelite had little conception." Nevertheless, even in its pre-prophetic stage the religion of Israel "was a worthy foundation for the more spiritual and ethical message of the prophets, just as their message was a foundation for the gospel of Jesus." The Old Testament religion rooted in the primitive religion of the Semites, but at the same time leading on to and coming to its full fruition in the religion of the New Testament—such is also the leading conception in Mr. Adams' "Studies in Old Testament Theology." But there is this to be said: the author's conception of growth prevents him from "reading too little into the Hebrew Scriptures." "The entire oak is already rolled up in the acorn; and everything that is yet to grow and effloresce in the gospel age is already planted or sown in the faith of Israel." Semitic monolatry leads to prophetic monotheism, and that to the New Testament Fatherhood. The writer devotes the greater part of his book to a sympathetic presentation of the doctrines contained in the Old Testament on the subjects of the spirit, sacrifice, the covenant, prophecy, the Messianic functions (the prophetic and priestly, the function of suffering), the divine wisdom, sin, salvation. The highest expres-

sion of Israel's ideal the author finds in Micah 6, 8. All through the volume which is written in a pleasing style there runs a sympathetic attitude toward that which from a Christian point of view is naturally only a preparatory stage for the consummation in the Gospels. The writer gives expression to a truth so easily overlooked by many that great religious leaders are far ahead of their times; and if the principle of growth is accepted, the germ of the future must indeed be traced to the hoary past. Nor is he blind to the fact that even in the religion which has the Gospel as its basis the masses have ever been prone to fall back into mechanical ceremonial. And so in Old Testament times, likewise, the spiritual religion of Moses and the prophets had at every turn to contend with the grosser conceptions of the masses. Nevertheless it was given to Israel to work out the ideal of righteousness, loving-kindness, and spiritual humble-mindedness. It is certainly refreshing to see the religion of the Hebrew Scriptures taken at its highest, the tendency of pure historical criticism with its analytic dissection and its regress to beginnings operating for the most part in the opposite direction.

Isaias. Diligenter revisus iuxta massorah (*sic*) atque editiones principes cum variis lectionibus e mss. atque antiquis versionibus collectis a C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D. Londinii: sumptibus SOCIETATIS BIBLIOPHILORUM BRITANNICAE ET EXTERNAE, MCMIX. pp. 93.

Specimina Codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum. Collegerunt PIUS FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI et IOHANNES LIETZMANN. Bonnae: A. MARCUS ET E. WEBER (Oxoniae: apud PARKER ET FILIUM), MCMX. pp. xvi + tabb. 50.

Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Heft I: *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch.* Von ERNST HAUTSCH. Berlin: WEIDMANNSCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. 28.

Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta. Die Propheten. Von Dr. O. PROCKSCH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1910. pp. 136.

The Octateuch in Ethiopic according to the text of the Paris codex, with the variants of five other manuscripts. Edited by Dr. J. OSCAR BOYD. Part I. Genesis. Leyden: E. J. BRILL (Princeton: The UNIVERSITY LIBRARY), 1909. pp. xxii + 158.

In a prospectus issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society under whose auspices the new edition of the Hebrew Scriptures by Dr. C. D. Ginsburg is to appear the undertaking is rightly compared to that of Holmes-Parsons' work on the Septuagint. To the writer of this review the point of comparison lies in the bewildering mass of sigla accompanying the variants. In other words, to judge from the specimen volume containing Isaiah, no attempt is being made in the grouping of the witnesses. If the Masoretic Text is primarily the text "found in manuscripts and early prints substantiated by that system of annotations which we call Masorah" (see this volume, 19), then the first duty of its editor must clearly be to lay before the reader an unambiguous statement as to which sources may properly be regarded as representing the Masorah. What a future edition of the Masoretic Text should look like the writer has pointed out on a previous occasion (*ibid.*, 21). Much preliminary labor will have to be done before that day will dawn. Meanwhile, it will be safe to follow Norzi in refraining from registering the material which the versions may yield in the distant future, but which at present is hardly so constituted as to find a place in the *apparatus criticus* of the Masoretic Text. The references to the versions, ornamental though they may be, will not be taken seriously, and should therefore be omitted entirely in the future instalments of Ginsburg's new Bible. I would further recommend that in the matter of variants of a direct character those bearing on the *ketib* and involving the consonants should be separated from those bearing on vocalization and accentuation. Nor is there any place in an edition like the present for conjectural emendation.—While the grouping of Hebrew manuscripts must be left to the distant future, two notable attempts at classifying the codices of the Greek Bible deserve mention. In a small pamphlet Hautsch presents the results of an examination of the text of the Antiochene fathers (Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Chrysos-

tom) for the Octateuch on the basis of quotations. It will be remembered that Lagarde long ago pointed out that the Bible of the Antiochene fathers will have been identical with Lucian's recension. Legarde, it seems, paid attention solely to the quotations from the historical books (Samuel, Kings). He came to the conclusion that the text of those citations tallied with the group consisting of 19. 82. 93. 108 and underlying his edition of Lucian. Hautsch, on the other hand, finds that at least for the Octateuch the Antiochene quotations do not square with that group at all, but with an entirely different group into which 54. 75 enter as elements and which has hitherto been identified with the Hesychian recension. It must be owned that an example like Josh. 10, 13 is an exceedingly telling one. If Hautsch's theory is to be accepted, then 19. 108 will have to be counted out from the group of manuscripts exhibiting Lucian's recension in the Octateuch; as a matter of fact, it has come to the notice of the writer that in the book of Joshua at least 19. 108 go frequently with Hexaplar codices like G or F; sometimes a reading of the Syrohexaplar can be found only in those two Greek cursives. As for 118 which Lagarde included among Lucianic codices, the writer has observed that in the book of Joshua it goes frequently with 54. 75. It is interesting to note that the series undertaken by the Göttingen academy known as its "Septuaginta-Unternehmen" of which Hautsch's publication forms the beginning owes its existence to Lagarde's initiative and, I believe, is maintained by the same scholar's legacy. Verily, science is no respecter of persons!—The story of the Greek text of the Prophets is, according to Procksch, an exceedingly complicated one. Of the extant manuscripts there is none that does not show traces of revision. By the aid of the marginal notes of the Marchalianus (Q) a large group of cursives (Group I) reveals itself as directly Hexaplaric, that is to say as a more or less faithful transcript of the Septuagint column in Origen's Hexapla. Hexaplaric readings have found their way also into the uncials, viz. the Vaticanus (B), the Sinaiticus (Ⲛ), and the Venetus (= 23); the latter is also infected with readings from the Lucianic recension which in the main underlies a group of cursives designated as III. The Lucianic recension was in itself a very complicated affair. Lucian made use of the Hexapla and

more directly of the Hebrew text itself; moreover, he revised the Greek of the Septuagint so as to bring it up to the level of Atticistic Greek. Between the two groups I and III, an intermediate group of cursives designated as II may lay claim to represent the pre-Hexaplaric text, though in its present form it has undergone revision on the basis of the Hexapla (particularly in Ezekiel, to a less extent in Jeremiah; the Twelve and Isaiah are on the whole freest from Hexaplaric admixture), but also of Lucian. On the whole, the Alexandrinus of the prophetic books is a purer text than the Vaticanus. The preference usually given to B rests on the pernicious "Vatican dogma." It is to be regretted that A was not made the basis of the English Septuagint. Over against this it behooves us, however, to remember that what is true of the Prophets may not be true of the other books. Even among the prophetic books, the story of the text differs. Silberstein has proved that in the II and III Kingdoms B by all means represents the purer text. Others have proved the same to be the case with other books of the Octateuch. Both at Göttingen and Cambridge scholars are busy unraveling the complex history of the Greek text; what may be done by the aid of the Oxford Septuagint has been demonstrated by Procksch.—We need a larger number of students to assist in the work of grouping. Such labor requires training, not the least part of which is the ability to decipher and collate. It is not given to everybody to study the manuscripts in the various libraries where they are at present treasured. The publication by Cavalieri and Lietzmann enables young scholars to learn Greek palæography at a distance. The specimens are without exception taken from Vatican manuscripts; moreover, they cover the entire range of Greek literature, the profane or classical included. Nevertheless, a sufficient number of biblical specimens is included. Thus table 1 contains a specimen from the Vaticanus (B), table 4 from the Marchalianus (Q). It is to be regretted that no biblical cursives are included. But the aim of the editors has been to give specimens of the older manuscripts, particularly of those whose date may be readily ascertained. The student is thus afforded the opportunity of learning to decipher cursive script in the first place, and in the second place to study the script of each century. A small list of the principal works

dealing with Greek palæography is appended to the Introduction; no library should be without them.—Of what value the Ethiopic version is for the student of the Septuagint is a matter of dispute. In all likelihood the case is not the same in the various parts of Scripture. That the Ethiopic manuscripts underwent revision in the course of time cannot be gainsaid; it is quite likely that the Hebrew text had a more or less direct influence on the later manuscripts. For his edition of the Ethiopic Octateuch Dillmann used four manuscripts in all. The new edition of the Ethiopic Octateuch which is being prepared by Dr. Boyd and of which the first part containing Genesis appeared last year rests so far as the text goes on the oldest manuscript, a Paris codex designated by the editor as Y, while in the notes variants are given from a manuscript in the possession of Haverford College (R) in addition to the readings from the codices made use of by Dillmann. The style of the publication is modeled after the larger Cambridge Septuagint; minor orthographic peculiarities and scribal errors of the main codex are registered immediately below the text. It is to be hoped that the publication of the remainder of the Octateuch will not be delayed too long.

The Authorized Version of the Bible and its Influence. By ALBERT S. COOK. New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1910. pp. iii + 80.

Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches. Von ARNOLD B. EHRLICH. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS'SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG. I. Genesis und Exodus. 1908. pp. iv + 424. II. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium. 1909. pp. 355. III. Josua, Richter, I. und II. Samuelis. 1910. pp. 346.

Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. In Verbindung mit... übersetzt und herausgegeben von E. KAUTZSCH. Dritte, völlig neugearbeitete, mit Einleitungen und Erklärungen zu den einzelnen Büchern versehene Auflage. I & II. Tübingen: J. C. B. MOHR (PAUL SIEBECK), 1909-1910. pp. viii + 952; viii + 629.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. By JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Hon M. A. (Cantab.). New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. lxxvii + 551.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Chronicles. By EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS, Ph.D., D.D., and ALBERT ALONZO MADSEN, Ph.D. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1910. pp. xxii + 534.

The Analyzed Bible. By the Rev. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. The Prophecy of Isaiah. 2 volumes. New York: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. pp. 225; 229.

The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers. In the language of the Revised Version of the English Bible, printed in their metrical form, with headings and brief annotations. Edited by FRANCIS H. WOODS, B.D., and FRANCIS E. POWELL, M.A. In four volumes. Vol. I.—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah (1-39), and Micah. Vol. II.—Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah. Oxford: at the CLARENDON PRESS, 1909-1910. pp. xxxii + 192; x + 240.

The Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOHN EDGAR MCFADYEN, D.D. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xiv + 423.

The Authorized Version of the English Bible the tercentenary of the publication of which occurs this year is made the subject of a small booklet by Prof. Cook. The great influence which the older English version has exercised on English literature is traced with expert skill. The English Bible was long in the making; the version of 1611 was based on a long line of predecessors. But it excelled them all. It possesses a rhythm and a swing peculiarly its own. Of course, its language was not the language of the seventeenth century. No literary language squares with the idiom of the day. The biblical phraseology had been shaped by generations. Nor is the English of the Authorized Version obsolete to-day. There is a marked return to older standards in the best literary efforts of the hour. There is no modern writer but will betray acquaintance with biblical phraseology. In the last resort the

beauty of Bible language rests on the simplicity of the original. And in this regard the Old Testament obviously transcends the New. With the simplicity of construction and style goes the simplicity and universality of subject-matter.—Of recent learned commentaries on the Scriptures the two new volumes of the *International Critical Commentary* deserve in particular to be singled out. In his work on Genesis, Dr. Skinner has taken cognizance both of Eerdmans and Wiener whose strictures are met by a searching argument. In the work on Chronicles prepared by a colleague and a disciple of Torrey the influence of the latter's criticism naturally manifests itself, but none too obtrusively. Altogether the two volumes come up to the high standard of some of the best volumes of the series, notably that of Driver's work on Deuteronomy or Moore's on Judges. They are full of up-to-date information, and nothing is too trifling to merit comment.—Of Ehrlich's great German work the first three volumes have appeared. It represents a revision of his Hebrew work. No matter how one may object to certain mannerisms and especially the cynicism with which things hallowed by Jewish tradition and sentiment are handled, it is gratifying to observe that Ehrlich's great insight into the Hebrew language is coming to be recognized by scholars. It is a great lifework which none can afford but to take seriously.—The third edition of the Kautzsch Bible has made its appearance. The learned editor has laid his pen away for ever; he died while the work was in progress; the work of completion was left to his colleague Rothstein. The new edition differs from the previous ones in that the translation is accompanied by explanatory notes which as far as possible are free from the technicalities inherent in the larger commentaries; a short preface precedes each book. While the work is intended for wider circles, it is safe to say that it will continue to be used by theological students.—Of a distinctly popular character are the various attempts to make the Bible accessible to the English lay reader. Rev. Morgan's "Analyzed Bible" of which Isaiah has appeared aims by minute analysis to bring the biblical literature home to every inquiring mind. Its tone is conservative. The spiritual force of the biblical word is brought out with skill; historical orientation is provided

for. The Oxford Prophets for English readers are based on the Revised Version. In the notes which are brief and to the point much elucidation is given. The marginal notes of the Revised Version are retained; but a preference for some of the renderings there contained is indicated. The succinct headings will prove a great aid to understanding. Short introductions are prefixed to each book. As the chronological arrangement of the books shows, the point of view is a critical one; the short lines in which the prophetic utterances are printed serve to bring out the literary character of Hebrew prophecy. The Macmillan Bible for Home and School of which the first volume contains Isaiah by Dr. McFadyen differs from the Cambridge Bible and similar publications in that the text adopted is that of the Revised Version and that the notes, while full, deal much less with the strictly technical aspect of interpretation.

Selections from the Old Testament. Edited with introduction and notes by FRED NEWTON SCOTT. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xxvi + 335.

The Old Testament Narrative. Separated out, set in connected order, and edited by ALFRED DWIGHT SHEFFIELD. Boston and New York: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, 1910. pp. xxi + 510.

The Narrative Bible. Edited by CLIFTON JOHNSON. New York: THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY, 1910. pp. 402.

Bible Stories to tell children. By WILLIAM D. MURRAY. New York: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. pp. 211.

To those who regret the wide-spread ignorance of the Bible on the part of the youth these works will prove welcome. Common to all is the retention of the Authorized Version in its main features. The Bible word is left as a rule to explain itself. Short notes and glossaries do the rest. Only in Murray's book intended for children is the biblical phraseology recast. Scott and Sheffield limit themselves to the Old Testament. Jewish readers will find Scott's little book exceedingly serviceable and freest from all bias; in Sheffield's work, suitable as it is in general, the point of view

is critical; with this fact in mind, the Jewish father may still unhesitatingly place it within the reach of his children. Both are well printed.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS

MEYER'S "THE GRADED SUNDAY SCHOOL"

The Graded Sunday School in Principle and Practice. By HENRY H. MEYER.. New York: EATON AND MAINS; Cincinnati: JENNINGS AND GRAHAM, 1910 (Modern Sunday School Manuals. Edited by CHARLES FOSTER KENT in collaboration with JOHN T. McFARLAND). p. viii + 241.

IF good method and correct discipline are important in the management of the secular school, they are essential in religious instruction, to which only a limited time is allowed by most religious denominations. Having this in mind, Mr. Meyer makes a strong plea in this little book for a more general introduction of the graded system in Sunday School work and offers some definite suggestions how this could be carried out. It appears that such an appeal is still necessary, in spite of the rapid advance made in recent years in the theory and practice of education.

Mr. Meyer judiciously divides his book into three parts, discussing first the theoretical aspect of the question, then its historical development and concluding with several concrete examples, proving the superiority of this method.

The first part might in itself form an excellent guide for Sunday School teachers. The author concisely but clearly presents here the relationship of the various elements of the school, showing the duties of each and the way for a harmonious working for them. The author lays especial stress on the educational element in religious instruction (p. 7), still necessary in many schools where instruction sometimes tends to become a species of evangelization or a means of conversion. A plan of organization and grading covering the whole course of Sunday School work is presented in chapter VIII, supplemented by a detailed discussion of the subject-matter of instruction given in the following chapter.

In the second part, Mr. Meyer gives a résumé of the historical development of the graded system through the conventions of the International Sunday School Union and in several individual church organizations.

The author concludes his argument by giving several notable examples of schools where the graded system has been in operation. The Model Sunday School of Columbia University (Teachers' College), the University Congregational School of Chicago, and the Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School of Chicago are given detailed treatment in the first chapter, while other typical schools, among them the School of Temple Emanu-El of New York are discussed in another chapter. The last few chapters are devoted to some practical suggestions as to the introduction of the graded system.

Considering that out of the 1,400,000 officers and teachers of the Sunday Schools in the United States, only 10,000 are known to have received any training, we pardon the author for giving so much space to the minutest details, almost precluding any initiative on the part of teacher or superintendent.

The book is provided with a useful summary, containing questions for review, and also with a Selected Bibliography of books that will prove useful to the earnest teacher.

Gratz College

JULIUS H. GREENSTONE

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Book above every Book. A popular illustrated report of the British and Foreign Bible Society 1909-1910. The BIBLE HOUSE, Queen Victoria Street, London. 123 pp.

The Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man. Being the evolution of religious doctrines from the eschatology of the Ancient Egyptians. By ALBERT CHURCHARD, M.D., M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.G.S., P.M., P.Z. London: SWAN SONNENSCHN & Co., Lim. (New York: E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY), 1910. xv + 449 pp.

Time and Free Will. An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness. By HENRI BERGSON, Member of the Institute, Professor at the College de France. Authorized translation by F. L. POGSON, M.A. London: SWAN SONNENSCHN & Co., Lim. (New York: The MACMILLAN COMPANY), 1910. xxiii + 252 pp.

Matter and Memory. By HENRI BERGSON, Member of the Institute, Professor at the College de France. Authorized translation by NANCY MARGARET PAUL and W. SCOTT PALMER. London, SWAN SONNENSCHN & Co., Lim. (New York: The MACMILLAN Co), 1911. xx + 339 pp.

Step by Step. A Story of the Early Days of Moses Mendelssohn. By ABRAM S. ISAACS. Philadelphia, The JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA, 1910. 166 pp.

The History of a Soul. An attempt at Psychology. By GEORGE RAFFALOVITCH, author of "On the Loose," "The Deuce and All," etc. London: The EQUINOX, 124, Victoria Street, S. W., 1910. 296 pp.

Anathema. A Tragedy in Seven Scenes. By LEONID ANDREYEV.
Authorized Translation by HERMAN BERNSTEIN. New York:
The MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1910. vi + 211 pp.

Selections for Homes and Schools. Compiled by MARION L.
MISCH. Philadelphia: The JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF
AMERICA, 1911. 444 pp.

*Die Entdeckungsreise des Herr Dr. Theodor Lessing zu den
Ostjuden.* Von BENJAMIN SEGAL. Lemberg, 1910. Verlag
"HATIKWA," Mickiewiczgasse 5.

Hungary in the Eighteenth Century. By HENRY MARZALL. With
an Introductory Essay on the Earlier History of Hungary by
HAROLD W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse Cam-
bridge. Cambridge: at the UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1910. lxiv +
377.

Darwin and the Humanities. By JAMES MARK BALDWIN, D.Sc.,
LL.D., Foreign Correspondent of the Institute of France.
Second Edition. London: SWAN SONNENSCHN & Co., Ltd.,
25 High Street, Bloomsbury, W. C., 1910. xi + 125 pp.

The Ancient Therapists. A lecture delivered before the Psycho-
Therapeutic Society, at The Caxton Hall, London, S. W., on
December 6th, 1909, by Her Excellency PRINCESS KARADJA (of
Bovigny Castle, Belgium). London: Messrs. KEGAN PAUL,
TRENCH, TRUEBNER & Co., Ltd., Gerrard Street, London, W. C.,
1911. 19 pp.

END OF VOLUME I NEW SERIES

DS
101
J5
v.1

The Jewish quarterly review.
New ser.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
